

OBJECTIONS

TO A

Pamphlet lately published,

INTITULED,

*Critical Notes on some Passages
of Scripture.*



[Price One Shilling and Six-pence.]

OBJECTIONS

TO THE

OBJECTIONS

TO A

Pamphlet lately published,

INTITLED,

Critical Notes on some Passages
of Scripture.

BY

[Price One Shilling and Six-pence]

OBJECTIONS

TO A

Pamphlet lately published,

INTITULED,

*Critical Notes on some Passages
of Scripture.*

WITH AN

INTRODUCTION;

Wherein are laid down

Certain *Rules* and *Precautions* necessary to be observed, in comparing the
ANCIENT VERSIONS with the HEBREW TEXT.

In a LETTER to the AUTHOR.

By E. LANGFORD, M. A.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. Fox, in Westminster-Hall,
and H. CLEMENTS at Oxford.

MDCCLXVII.

OBJECTIONS

TO A

Pamphlet lately published,

INTITLED,

Critical Notes on some Passages
of Scripture.

WITH AN

INTRODUCTION;

Wherein are laid down

Certain Rules⁴³ and Precautions nec-
essary to be observed⁴⁴ in comparing the
Ancient Versions with the Hebrew Text.
⁴⁵⁶

In a LETTER to the AUTHOR.

By E. LANGFORD, M.A.

Printed for J. Oakes, Westminster-Hall,
and H. Oakes, at Oxford.

MDCCLXXII.





THE INTRODUCTION.

SIR,

THE following Objections, to your learned Notes, took their Rise, not from a Spirit of *Contradiction*, or any other *vain* Affectation; but from a Love of *Truth*, and a Desire of being *rightly* inform'd in so *important* a Point, as the *Study* of the Scriptures must be confessed to be. You, I doubt not, had the same View in making your Observations; since I think myself concerned to believe, what you freely declare to be true, “ that nothing was farther
“ from your Intention, than by them to
“ lessen, in any Degree, the just Veneration
“ of the Public for these inestimable Remains
“ of Antiquity.” Such a laudable Design,
“ as the restoring of the sacred Books to
B “ the

“ the *original* Reading and *true* Sense ” will be owned to be, is an Undertaking of all others the most becoming a Person of Learning, Sagacity, and Judgment; and what cannot fail of convincing the serious Part of Mankind, that, let the Author succeed in his Attempt, or not, he has yet spent his Hours in the most noble Pursuit.

The main *Drift* of your Enquiries is to prove, that *Errors* are crept into the present Reading of the *Hebrew* Text: A Point wherein, as you remark, learned Men are now generally agreed: and, I will add, which your Observations *sometimes* render very probable. And if an *unexceptionable* Method could be proposed, which might enable the learned Reader to trace out and discover those slight Mistakes, which have been introduced either thro’ the Carelessness of Transcribers, or any other Cause, a Service might be hereby done to the Cause of Religion.

The *Method* you use to *detect* these Errors is, “ by comparing the present Reading of “ the *Hebrew* Text, with the most ancient “ Versions; ” or, as you more fully explain your Meaning in your Advertisement, “ either by Interpretation, or by Alteration of “ the Words, where the Sense and the old “ Versions would warrant it.” This Method, under certain Restrictions and Precautions (hereafter to be mentioned) is a good and plausible Method. You have accordingly *in-*
terpreted

terpreted Scripture sometimes by supplying its Deficiencies from the ancient *Versions*, as at *Gen.* iv. 3. and again at *Exod.* xii. 40^a; sometimes also from external or profane *History*, as in your Exposition of the *Revelation*, after the Plan of other learned Men; and from the Observations of judicious and creditable *Travellers*, as at *Gen.* xxii. 1, 2. You have also *altered* the Words of the *Hebrew* Text; and sometimes, when you seem to have Reason on your Side. Nor must I here omit, that in your Interpretations of Scripture you have often used the Expedient, which is now most universally approved, *viz.* *The Assistance of the Eastern Dialects*, to help the present Poverty of the *Hebrew* Tongue; which is one of the best Means to reconcile the ancient Versions to the *Hebrew* Text.

Had you *steadily* pursued this Method under certain Precautions, you had *solved* many Difficulties you have raised, and the Trouble, I now give, had been *spared*. But in some Cases you have not *kept* to your Rule; and in others it has *failed* you. For,

• It may not be amiss to add what Dean *Prideaux* says concerning these Supplements to the present *Hebrew* Text, from the *Samaritan* Copy: "Both these Additions, it is manifest, mend the Text, and make it more clear and intelligible, and seem to add nothing to the *Hebrew* Copy, but what must be understood by the Reader, to make out the Sense thereof." *Connexion*, Part. I. B. 6. A. 409.

as I before said, your Method of interpreting or altering the *Hebrew* Words, as the *Sense* and the *Versions* warrant it, is a good Method, in the *general*, for the restoring the sacred Books to their original Reading and true Sense; yet it should not be admitted against the Authority of the present *Hebrew* Text, without some previous *Restrictions* and necessary *Precautions*. What these *Precautions* are, I shall first *enumerate*; and then *apply* them, as I shall find Cause, to your *Observations*.

1. The first necessary Precaution to be observed, before we venture to alter the present *Hebrew* Text on the Warrant of the *Sense* and *Versions*, is, That we do not mistake a *supposed*, or *imaginary* Sense, for the *true* and *genuine* Meaning of Scripture. For nothing is more notorious, than that very many Texts are capable of receiving an Interpretation, plausible, and seemingly well-grounded, which will not, however, be allowed to be the true and proper Sense of those Texts, or their Contexts: And should any one go about to *alter* the Words of the *Hebrew* Copy, according to such an Interpretation, he would certainly *introduce* a Corruption, instead of *removing* one. Herein lyes the very great Danger, that attends such *adventurous* Criticisms, as strike at the *Authenticity* and *Genuineness* of the sacred Text: since a Reading, which seems to us *obscure* and unintelligible, may

may not so seem to others; who may be able to *explain* it on the most rational Principles. The *different* Expositions, which are given to the *same* Text by very learned and sagacious Commentators, abundantly prove, that Scripture is often capable of admitting a supposed, or imaginary Sense. And as such a Sense, is not the Sense, which *properly* belongs to the Words of Scripture, this ought to be carefully *distinguished* from *that*, and should never be alleged in Prejudice to the present Reading of the sacred Text. Whenever therefore I shall hereafter say, that the *Sense warrants* such an Alteration, I mean nothing else, than that the Words will *seemingly* admit of such a Sense.

2. We must not alter the *Hebrew* Text, where the Sense and the Versions warrant such an Alteration, till, secondly, we are sure, that the *Hebrew* Text and the Versions *disagree*. For it is evident, that, where there is no Disagreement, an Alteration is unnecessary. Now many *seeming*, and not real Differences, occur between the *Hebrew* Text and the Versions, which take their Rise, First, from, a *lost* Sense of the *Hebrew* Word, which it was known to have, when those Versions were made. Herein the *Eastern* Dialects will sometimes help us to *recover* the lost Sense; and sometimes perhaps not. But as it would be *unreasonable* to remove a *Hebrew* Word out of the Text, when these Dialects will

will help us; so may it be at all times *unsafe* to discard it, when they will not. Secondly, these *seeming* Differences arise also from another *similar* Source (especially in comparing the Seventy's Version with the *Hebrew* Text) when the *Greek* Word may seem to differ from the *Hebrew*, where it really doth not. Now the Seventy are known to use their Words in a Sense *peculiar* to themselves; and for which we shall sometimes in vain seek for a *classical* Authority. This Sense, which the Seventy have *imposed* sometimes on the *Greek* Words, is termed from them *Hellenistical*. I need not produce Instances in a Case so notorious; and shall only add, that every Alteration made in the *Hebrew* Text on this Score would be made without Cause.

3. In comparing the ancient Versions with the *Hebrew* Text, we must take Care we do not suppose a Difference between them, when instead of a *literal* Translation, they give us their *Interpretation*, or *Comment*. This is remarkably the Case of the Seventy; who very often *comment*, rather than *translate*; and sometimes with so *lax* and *unconfined*^a a Liberty, that an incautious Reader may be induced to suppose, their *Hebrew* Copies exhibited a Reading very different from what

^a Nec inusitatum est τοῖς ὁ sensum quemlibet idoneum potius quam Literam sequi. Prol. ad Proph. Libb. § 4. Alex. Vers. Ed. Grabe.

ours now give us. Now it is easy to conceive, that when a *lax* Interpretation is given, instead of a *literal* Translation, the Words of the Text cannot well *suit* with its Version; and yet to *alter* the Text to this Version (which Alteration the *Sense* must in this Case always warrant, if the Interpretation be just) would be a Liberty not to be allowed. Instances of this Sort you will find under my Second Objection.

4. In altering the *Hebrew* Text to the Sense and Authority of the ancient Versions, we must be certain, that the Versions are themselves *pure* and *uncorrupt*. For a *false* Reading of the Versions may sometimes agree with the Sense; and yet both these, tho' agreeing well together, will not always prove, that the Text should be *altered*. For instance: Notwithstanding the infinite Care and uncommon Sagacity of Dr. *Grabe*, there are some *Interpolations*, or *false Readings*, still subsisting in the *Oxford* Edition of the *Alexandrian* Copy, which are as *old* as the Days of *Justin Martyr*; who tells *Trypho*^a, that the *Jews* (meaning, I suppose, *Aquila*, who had apostatized from *Christianity*, and was become a *Jew*) had changed the old *Seventy's* Version in the following Instances. *Isa.* iii. 10. instead of the *Seventy's* ἀἰσχρολογία

^a *Dial.* cum Tryphone, p. 117. & deinceps. Gr. Ed. [ut opinor] R. *Stephani*.

will help us; so may it be at all times *unsafe* to discard it, when they will not. Secondly, these *seeming* Differences arise also from another *similar* Source (especially in comparing the Seventy's Version with the *Hebrew Text*) when the *Greek Word* may seem to differ from the *Hebrew*, where it really doth not. Now the Seventy are known to use their Words in a Sense *peculiar* to themselves; and for which we shall sometimes in vain seek for a *classical* Authority. This Sense, which the Seventy have *imposed* sometimes on the *Greek Words*, is termed from them *Hellenistical*. I need not produce Instances in a Case so notorious; and shall only add, that every Alteration made in the *Hebrew Text* on this Score would be made without Cause.

3. In comparing the ancient Versions with the *Hebrew Text*, we must take Care we do not suppose a Difference between them, when instead of a *literal* Translation, they give us their *Interpretation*, or *Comment*. This is remarkably the Case of the Seventy; who very often *comment*, rather than *translate*; and sometimes with so *lax* and *unconfined*^a a Liberty, that an incautious Reader may be induced to suppose, their *Hebrew Copies* exhibited a Reading very different from what

^a Nec inusitatum est τοῖς ὁ sensum quemlibet idoneum potius quam Literam sequi. Prol. ad Proph. Libb. § 4. Alex. Vers. Ed. Grabe.

ours now give us. Now it is easy to conceive, that when a *lax* Interpretation is given, instead of a *literal* Translation, the Words of the Text cannot well *suit* with its Version; and yet to *alter* the Text to this Version (which Alteration the *Sense* must in this Case always warrant, if the Interpretation be just) would be a Liberty not to be allowed. Instances of this Sort you will find under my Second Objection.

4. In altering the *Hebrew* Text to the Sense and Authority of the ancient Versions, we must be certain, that the Versions are themselves *pure* and *uncorrupt*. For a *false* Reading of the Versions may sometimes agree with the Sense; and yet both these, tho' agreeing well together, will not always prove, that the Text should be *altered*. For instance: Notwithstanding the infinite Care and uncommon Sagacity of Dr. Grabe, there are some *Interpolations*, or *false Readings*, still subsisting in the *Oxford* Edition of the *Alexandrian* Copy, which are as *old* as the Days of *Justin Martyr*; who tells *Trypho*^a, that the *Jews* (meaning, I suppose, *Aquila*, who had apostatized from *Christianity*, and was become a *Jew*) had changed the old *Seventy's* Version in the following Instances. *Isa.* iii. 10. Instead of the *Seventy's* *αἰρωμεν*

^a *Dial.* cum Tryphone, p. 117. & deinceps. Gr. Ed. [ut opinor] R. *Stephani*.

τὸν δικαῖον. they had translated the Words, *δύσαντες τὸν δικαῖον*. Again, *Psal. lxxxii. 7.* the Seventy's *ἰδὲ δὴ* ^b they had altered into *ὑμεῖς ᾗ*. Both these Alterations afterwards crept into the *Alexandrian* Copy; and there continue to this Day. So had likewise τὰ δόξανόμενα αὐτοῦ, *Gen. xlix. 10.* but this is rejected by the most learned Editor, and the original ᾧ δόξανται replaced. Lastly, *Deut. xxxii. 8.* instead of the Seventy's, *ἔφησεν ὁ θεὸς ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀρεθμὸν Ἀγγέλων Θεῶν*, they rendered the last Words κατὰ ἀρεθμὸς ὑῶν Ἰσραὴλ. Here the *Alexandrian* Copy preserved indeed its own primitive Reading: but altho' *this* had the good Fortune to escape, yet the *Hebrew* Text had not; for it was afterwards forced to speak according to this false Reading; and there the Corruption hath been permitted to abide. To apply this to our Purpose. Let us, for Example, suppose, that some ancient Versions agree to read with the *Alexandrian Psal. lxxxii. 7.* ὑμεῖς δὲ. The Words must be confessed to suit well the Text and Context. But will it follow in this Case, that we must part with the present Reading יְכָנ and substitute יְכָנ in its Room? No, we should reject the *true* Reading, for one that is *spurious*; and consequently corrupt that Text, which we designed to *amend*. A *false* Reading of the Versions, therefore, may

^a So we still read in Clemens Alex. p. 494. Ed. Cl. Potteri.

sometimes

sometimes suit the Sense, and yet the Agreement of both these will not always prove, that an *Alteration* should be made of the *Hebrew Word*.

To this it may be objected, that, when a Number of antient Versions agree in one common Reading, we cannot well suppose, that a Reading, so *unanimously* supported, is an *Interpolation*. To which I answer, First, That a Number of Versions are not so *likely* to be interpolated as one; but it is not *impossible*, that the same designing Heads may, in Length of Time, be able to compass a Corruption in many. One would scarcely have thought, that, notwithstanding *Justin* had given this early Notice of what the *Jews* were doing in those early Days, the *Christians* would have permitted the Errors above mentioned, to find a Place in their *Greek Copies of the Bible*: Much less, that the Error at *Deut. xxxii. 8.* should be afterwards communicated to the *Hebrew Text*. You see here are two Copies, the *Hebrew* and the *Alexandrian Version*, corrupted with the same Interpolations, as it were, before the Face of *Christians*. And, if the *Jews* were able to obtrude a Corruption on these two, which were so much used, what a fine Opportunity had they to corrupt the other *Eastern Versions*, which were in less Repute, less carefully guarded, and not so generally used;

used; those of them, I mean, which are as old as *Justin's Days*?

Secondly, That, in urging the Authority of a Number of Versions, it should be previously examin'd, whether these many Versions are not made from *one* and the *same* Translation; for if the rest be found to be taken from the same Version, they have *altogether* the Authority only of that *one*: And under the *false* Appearance of a *Numben*, we shall be in danger of *imposing* on ourselves and others; and give a *Weight* to a single Evidence, which it will not *bear*. But this Point will be more fully *considered*, and properly *applied* under my first Objection.

5. Many Sentences and Words of the *Hebrew* Text are capable of a *twofold* Translation. Hence nothing is more common, than to meet, in the *Alexandrian* Version, with a *double* Interpretation of the *same* Period. In which Case, the Sense may not always *determine*, to which Interpretation the *Preference* should be given. And yet, if the antient Versions, by supporting one Rendition more than the other, should induce any one to fix on *that*, which being admitted may favour a slight Variation in the *Hebrew* Text, such a *Variation* would be made without a *just* Cause. I will produce an Instance of this from *Hof. xiii. 3.* "They shall be as the Smoak out of a Chimney," which
last

last Words are in the Original **מִאֲרָבָה**. Now **מִאֲרָבָה** signifies a *Locust* and a *Chimney*. The Sense direct us seemingly to chuse the latter Meaning. *Theodotion's* Version, the *Alexandrian* Copy, *Cyril*, and an antient *Latin* Version, translate the *Hebrew* in this latter Sense. Yet *St. Hierom*, *Theodoret*, and a MS. Copy in the *King's Library* prove, that the *Seventy* did originally translate it in the former, ἀρῦς ἀπὸ Ἀργιδῶν, as a *Vapour dispersed by a Cloud of Grasshoppers*, according to *Theodoret's* Interpretation. Here is a *twofold* Interpretation of the same *Hebrew* Word; each Interpretation has it's *Vouchers*; and each it's *Advocates*; who attempt to reconcile it to the Sense. But if the former be admitted, which, as *Hierom* assures us, was the primitive Reading of the *Seventy*, a *Variation* must be made in the present *Hebrew* Text, and *arubbab* must be changed into *arbeh*. The Consent therefore of the Versions and the Sense may not always lead us to the *true* and *original* Reading, when the *Hebrew* Word is capable of a *twofold* Interpretation.

It is true, that in the Case now mentioned there is no *literal* Variation, and perhaps you may esteem this Instance, for this Reason, *defective* in it's Proof of what it is brought to support. But if there be no *literal* Variation,

* *Vide* Prol. ad Hist. Libb. in locum.

there is a very great Difference in the *Sense*; and I suppose there was also in the *Sound* and Pronunciation of the *Hebrew* אֱלֹהִים, when it was used by the *Jews* in it's different Acceptations. But be this, as it may, if this Proof be *deficient* in this Respect, it however proves the *Possibility*, that the same Case may happen to other Words, when a *literal* Alteration must of Course ensue. And therefore I shall venture to subjoin to the former Observation, what I intended to remark, more especially of the *Hebrew* אֱלֹהִים, and it's twofold Signification: viz. That this Word, and it's double Sense of *God* and *not*, has often occasioned great Confusion in the *Seventy's Version*, where the Sense of the Period is not *express*, and *strong* enough to ascertain it's Meaning. Dr. *Grabe*, in his *Prolegomena* to the *Psalms*, has taken Notice of this, observing that the Word אֱלֹהִים being the last Word of *ψ* 2. *Psal.* xc. is there translated *God*, (as it is with us, *Thou art God from everlasting, and World without End.*) and standing close to the *ψ* iii. is taken also into that, and there rendered *not*, μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς, *Do not turn*, instead of, *Thou turnest Man to Destruction*. And hereafter I shall shew, that in the Course of your Observations, you have lighted on a Place parallel to this, and where the same Confusion occurs in the *Seventy's Version*. Here

* See what Dr. *Prideaux* says to this Purpose. *Con-
nection*, Part. I. B. 5.

is indeed no *literal* Variation in the *Hebrew*, read it as you will ; but there is an important Alteration made in the Sense : It is to read a *Noun* instead of a *Conjunction* ; *God* instead of *not* ; or *vice versâ* : And a *Negative* instead of an *Affirmative*.

6. The Sense of the Text, and the antient Versions will not always warrant a Variation of the *Hebrew* Words, when *this* differs from *those* in the Suffixa and *similar* Affixa. For I believe, (such was the Liberty the Seventy indulged themselves in, when they made their Version) that they altered them at their Pleasure, when such an Alteration did not *injure* the Sense *. Thus, for Instance, they thought it of no Consequence, and indeed it is not, whether they translated, *Psal.* l. 5. " Gather *my* Saints together unto *me* ; " or, " Be ye gathered unto *Him*, O ye *his* Saints." Nor again, whether they rendered, *Psal.* lxxiii. 1. " In a barren or dry Land," or, " As " a barren and dry Land." Besides the Af-

* On the Words of 1 *Sam.* i. 23. The Lord establish *his* Word, the learned Author of the *Prolegomena* to the Historical Books of Dr. *Grabe's* Edition of the *Alexandrian* Version, observes, that the MSS. Copies, and all the Editions of the Seventy read, The Lord establish *thy* Word. That for this Reason, *Capel* and others supposed the Seventy read *לברך* instead of *לברך*, as we now do : And then adds, Verum non est necesse, opinor, aliter legisse unum Interpretem, quam legebat alter. Eodem Res redit. He means by the other, the Author of the *Latin Vulgate*, who translates, *his* Word.

fix in the latter Instance, whether it was originally a *ו* or *ו*, might as well be mistaken by the *Translators* for each other, as afterwards by the *Transcribers* of the *Hebrew Copy*.

The Agreement therefore of the antient *Versions*, and the *Sensè* are not always an *infallible* Warrant for altering the *Hebrew Text*: And when they are, it should be remembered, such an Alteration is made, not so much because the *Versions recommend* it, as because the *Sense requires* it. The *Versions* then are only a *subordinate* and *inferior* Proof, that such an Alteration is necessary; which, if made at all, must be grounded *wholly* on the *Sense* of the Context, or other more express Declarations of Scripture. The unreasonable Prejudice, which some learned Men have conceived against the *Masoretical Points*, hath induced them to find *Fault* with the present Reading of the *Hebrew Text* without Cause, and to *over-rate* the Authority of the antient *Versions*: making *these*, as it were, the Touchstone of the Purity of *that*. But surely this was to *begin* at the *wrong* End; and a Way of Criticising which would not be endured on a classical Author. For this hath *L. Capel*^a among others been censured: Who,

^a Qui cum sint Textui Masoretico maximè infensi, Auctoritati LXX plurimum tribuere volunt: quales hoc Seculo fuere Morinus & Capellus, Viri sane docti, sed Hypothesibus suis nimis addicti, & Ingenio suo nimium plerumque tribu-

Who, from the best Judgment I am able to form of his Criticisms, mispent a great Deal of good Learning and Time in a fruitless Search: And I wish, I could not add, that you seem to follow his Steps too closely; on many Occasions.

But *L. Capel's* Scheme, bad as it was, is much more safe than that, which hath been lately espoused, viz. Of interpreting the *Hebrew* Text by a *supposed* Force and Power of the *Hebrew* Words, without any *Regard* had either to the *Masoretical* Pointings, or the Authority of the antient Versions. A Scheme this, which had been more *defensible*, if we had proper *Affistances* to *settle* the full Import and Meaning of the *Hebrew* Words, or had *better* Opportunities of doing this, than the antient Interpreters enjoyed. But, in the present State of the *Hebrew* Language, such a Scheme is *wild* and *impracticable*; and gives Room more to *Fancy* and *Conjecture* than to *Judgment* and sound *Reasoning*; and, I fear, will end, if encouraged, in an un-

tribuentes. *J. Pearsoni* Præf. Par. Saltem non tam iniquo adversus Heb. Masoretharum Textum Præjudicio—laboraverit (viz. Pearsonus) quod ipse merito in Morino & Capello—reprehendit. *Græbi* Postscriptum. Haud pauci Textui Masoretico maxime infensi, Versioni huic (LXX-virali) dum nimium tribuere volunt, Variationes ubique nimis avidè venantur, ut lectionem nimirum Masoreticam labefactent eleventque, &c. Inter quos—Leo Castrius, diu etiam ante Capellum. Prol. ad Hist. Libb. c. ii. § 35.

justifiable

justifiable *Licentiousness* of Scripture-Interpretation.

In Enquiries then, concerning the Purity of the present *Hebrew* Text, the antient *Versions* should not be disregarded, nor yet the *Masoretical Points*. Not the *former*; because those of them especially, which are *older* than the *latter* (as the *Seventy's Version* is computed to be above 800 Years) are the best *Helps* we can use to detect the *Disguise*, which hath been thrown on the *Hebrew* Text by the *Masoret Jews*, and to recover the original Reading: Moreover, because this very antient Version sometimes *fixes* a Meaning to a *doubtful* Passage; and shews us in what Sense an obscure and ambiguous Sentence of Scripture was understood by the antient *Jewish Church*. These are, I think, the two principal *Uses*, that may be fairly made of the Authority of the *Seventy's Version* in particular, considered apart by itself.

Nor should the *latter*, viz. the *Masoretical Points*, be totally disregarded; against which the greatest Exceptions are, their *Novelty*; the *Authors*, the *Jews*; and *their Design*, in inventing them, which some will say to have been the Doing of a *Hurt* to the Cause of *Christianity*. Be this true: I allow these are *reasonable* Exceptions. Yet it doth not follow, because the *Masorets* intended to obscure and corrupt those Passages of

of the *Old Testament*, which *had* a Reference to the *Messias*, that therefore they designed also to corrupt other Places, which had *none*. Consider this Matter with Coolness and Candour; and it will be confessed, that Pointings have a most excellent Use, in fixing the Meaning of such *Hebrew* Words, as are of doubtful Signification*. With them, for Instance, we shall no longer hesitate, whether *YH* signifies *God*, or *not*; the want of ascertaining which, so much perplexed, as we have seen, the antient Interpreters; and *having* them, we are no more tied down to read as they direct, than if we had them *not*.

I have confined the foregoing Precautions chiefly to the *Seventy's Version*, and the Use that may thereby be made of that in comparing it with the *Hebrew* Text, for a Reason, that will be assigned in my first Objection, which I now introduce.

OBJECTION I.

“ You lay a greater Stress on the Authority
“ of the antient Versions, than they will
“ bear.”

THIS I shall endeavour to prove in the following Particulars.

I. Some of your Observations, on the Authority of these Versions, propose a Variation,

* See Dr. *Prideaux*, as above, P. i. B. 5.

tion, where none is wanted ; whereas no Reading should be admitted against the Authority of the sacred Text, when the *present* Reading will do as well. Thus for Instance, *Psal.* li. 4. instead of “ that thou mightest be “ *clear*, when thou art judged,” you recommend the reading of תנעה for תזכה, because “ all the old Interpreters, except the “ *Chaldee*, translate, thou mightest *prevail*, “ or *overcome*.” To this you might have added, that the Words are *thus* also translated in the *New Testament*, *Rom.* iii. 4. after the *Greek Version*. But to be *clear*, or *overcome* in Judgment is one and the same Thing ; and since תזכה signifies the former, there is no Occasion to have Recourse to the Word תנעה, to help us out. But the Alteration you propose is an Alteration for the worse ; nor will the Word you recommend bear a Sense so *proper* to the *Psalmist's* Meaning, as that, which you are willing to remove. For is the Verb נצה ever used in a *judicial*, or *forensic* Sense ? I don't know that it is. On the other Hand the Word זכה properly signifies a *judicial* Acquittance ; and for this Reason is the most *pertinent* Word, that the *Psalmist* could use. But it seems the *Seventy* misled you by rendring it νικῶντες, which you did not recollect is itself often used, as *Budæus* and *H. Stephens* inform us, for overcoming in Judgment, as well as in Battle ; and so without Doubt the *Seventy* knew,

Again,

Again, on *Pſalm cxxxix. 9.* “ If I take
 “ the *Wings of the Morning*,” you remark,
 “ we never hear of any Wings belonging to
 “ the Morning,” and tell us “ that the *Syriac*
 “ and *Arabic* help us to a CLEARER Sense,
 “ by translating *what it is to be supposed they*
 “ *read in their Copies* כנשר, as an Eagle, if I
 “ take the Wings of an Eagle.” But how poor
 and low is this Expression, when compared
 with the bold and significant Terms of the
 present *Hebrew* Text? Experimental Philo-
 sophy assures us, that the Motion of Light
 exceeds that of a Cannon Ball, when it *first*
 issues out of the Mouth of the Cannon, by
 many thousand Degrees. Now both these
 Bodies, the *Light*, and *Ball*, fly with so
swift a Motion, as to *escape* the Notice of
 our Eye-sight; how infinitely then must the
 Motion of Light surpass that of the swiftest
 Eagle, whose Passage in the Air we can easily
trace? The *Hebrew* שחר signifies the *Morn-*
ing-Dawn; when the Light first begins to
 spread itself over the Face of the Earth, and
 hence, “ when the Morning rose,” *Gen.*
xix 15. is expressed in the *Hebrew* by the
 Verb עלה, *ascended*, denoting the upright
 Motion of it, as the ascending of *Smoke*, a

* Parallel to this is *Homer's* Expression. Il. B. 49.

Ἡὸς μίγξα Θέα ΠΡΟΣΕΒΗΣΑΤΟ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον

And *Milton's* B. vi. l. 1, 2.

Now Morn her rosie Steps in th' Eastern Clime
Advancing, sow'd the Earth with Orient Pearl.

Flame, an *Angel*, or a *Bird*, first *rising* on it's *Wings*. And, whereas you say, " we never hear of any *Wings* belonging to the *Morning*," I must remind you, that the antient Heathens used to assign to the Chariot of the Goddess *Aurora*, as well as to that of the *Sun*, *winged Horses*; which convey a Notion not unlike to the bold Expression of the *Psalmist*: And that *Wings* were usually attributed to the Goddess *Night*^a; which at least will clear the *Psalmist* from any Absurdity, or Impropriety of Speech, who applies them to the *Morning*. Moreover, if *Wings* be properly given to the *Wind*, as they are both by sacred^b and profane^c Writers, why may we not also say, " *If I take the Wings of the Morning?*"

Once more, *Numb. xvi. 5.* " Even to-morrow the Lord will shew, who are his." Here you cite *L. Capel* with Honour, who conjectured, " that, because the Seventy express the *Hebrew* כנף by ἐπίσημαι, they then read a Word not so different in the Figure of the Letters, as in the Sig-

^a Hence *Aristophanes* [ap. *H. Stephanum*] styles the *Night* μελανόπτερος, the *black-winged Night*: And *Horace* (as *H. Stephens* there notes) speaking of *Death*, under the Image and Circumstances of *Night*, says

Seu me mors atris circumvolat Alis.

^b *Psal. xviii. 10.* ^c So *Æschylus* in *Prometheus* l. 88. has ταχυνερόι πνοαί, the *swift-Winged Blasts*. To which Purpose many other Instances might be produced.

" nification

"nification, *בקר, inspecteth.*" But there is no Reason, to admit *Capel's* Variation. For the Word *בקר*, stript of it's Masoretical Pointings, will fully answer all the Purposes of *בקר*, which *Capel* proposes to place in it's Room. The Word properly signifies to *explore, examine, or inspect*; and is accordingly translated by the Seventy, *Lev. xiii. 36.* by the very Word *ἐξέτασιν*, which gave Rise to *Capel's* Criticism. Here then is a various Reading, but only in the *Masoretical* Pointings; since the *ו* prefix'd to *ק* plainly shews, that the preceeding Word must be a Verb; and therefore I make no Scruple to translate the Sentence, as you do, "The " Lord" [or *Jehovah*] inspecteth and know-
" eth who are his."

2. Another Instance of your *overstraining* the Authority of the antient Versions is, That you have not duly attended to the Probability of their being *corrupted* themselves. Of this your Observation on *Psal. xx. 7.* "We will remember the Name of " the Lord our God," furnishes us with a sufficient Proof. You there say, "That " instead of *נִכְרַר* we will remember, all " the oldest Interpreters found some Verb, " which signified, *we will be great, or strong,* " except the *Latin Vulgate*;" and therefore you recommend the Reading of *נִכְרַר* in it's Stead. The *Vulgate* here, you say, reads *invocabimus*, we will invoke or call upon;
and

and from hence I infer, that the Copy of the Seventy, from whence the Vulgate was translated, did then read, as the *Alexandrian* Copy, published by Dr. *Grabe*, and St. *Hierom's* Copy, printed in his Works, now do *ἐπικαλεσόμεθα*, and consequently, that a Corruption was introduced into the *Greek* Copy of the Seventy, since that *Latin* Translation was made. Now if this hath been the Fate of the Seventy's Version in the Passage before us, why may not the same Thing have happen'd to the *other* Versions in *other* Places?

You indeed partly allow this, when you say, " That the *Latin Vulgate* is not come down to us *uncorrupted*; for in it's present State, " *Hi in Curribus, & hi in Equis, nos autem in nomine Domini Dei nostri invocabimus*, it is neither *good Latin*, nor " *good Sense*." But I own, I do not always expect to read good *Latin* in the Vulgate. However, the *Latin* before us, tho' it makes the Verb *invocabimus* to refer to *Chariots* and *Horses*, as well as to the *Name* of the Lord our God, is *good Latin*, and justified by the Authority of the *purest* *Classical* Writers. Dr. *Davis* tells us, " *Scriptores idonei Verbum, quod plurium Nominum ultimo soli respondeat, apponunt*." This he notes on an Expression of *Cicero*^a, which is parallel

^a Neque irā neque gratiā teneri. De Nat. D. L. i. c. 17. N. 5.

to the Case before us, and produces other Examples of the like Nature: And your own Reading, I doubt not, will furnish you with more.

3. You *over-rate* the antient Versions, in citing them as *distinct* Authorities, when many of them are *one* and the *same* Authority. For, since the *Arabic*, *Æthiopic* and *Latin* Vulgate were all *taken* from the Seventy's Version*, they must all be *resolved* into the single Authority of *that*. And so must likewise *Apollinarius's* Translation of the *Psalms* in Verse: For it seems evident, both from his frequent *Agreement* with the Seventy; and from his servile *Imitation* of them, in the Instance produced by you on *Psal. xc. 11.* that he took no *other* Trouble with his Translation, than *barely* to throw the Seventy's Words into *Metre*, and to add to them a more *poetical* Turn. The *Sum* therefore of the Vouchers produced by you against the present Reading of the *Hebrew* Text are these *four*; the *Samaritan* Copy; the *Chaldee* Paraphrase; and the *Seventy's*, and the *Syriac* Versions. I shall close this Objection with a short *Account* of each, extracted, for the most Part, from the most learned Dean

* Vid. *Prideaux's* Connexion, Part. ii. B. i. p. 47. If these Versions therefore at any Time differ from the Seventy's, the Difference must be ascribed to the Errors, or Interpolations, with which our present *Greek* Copies abound.

Prideaux: Whereby we may be able to judge of what Use each may be to us, in comparing it with the *Hebrew Text*.

1. The *Samaritan Copy*, laying the best Claim to the greatest *Antiquity*, must be first considered. It is said to be that Copy of the Law of *Moses*, which *Manasseh*, having been expelled from *Jerusalem* by *Nehemiah*, carried with him; when, on the Invitation of *Sanballat*, he settled in *Samaria*, and afterwards became the High Priest of the Temple, which was built by the *Samaritans* upon Mount *Gerizim*. The *Antiquity* of this Copy therefore reaches (at the lowest Computation) within an Hundred and thirty Years of the Return of the *Jews* from *Babylon*; and as high as more than four hundred Years before *Christ*. It hath been carefully collated with the *Hebrew Text* more than once: And the *Variations* published; which are to be found in the last Edition of the *London Polyglot*. These *Variations* are said to be either manifest *Interpolations*, or the *Errors* of Transcribers; excepting the two Additions taken Notice of by you, at *Gen. iv. 8.* and *Exod. xii. 40.* Hence it follows, that this will not much assist us in making any new Discoveries; and that as many of it's *Variations* from the *Hebrew Text*, are manifestly caused by the Mistake of the similar Letters in the *Hebrew Language*, it may be

be *unsafe* to alter the *Hebrew* Text on the Authority of this Copy.

II. The *Greek* Version, commonly called the *Seventy's*, is supposed to have been made in the seventh or eighth Year of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*; i. e. about two Hundred and sixty Years after the Captivity, and two Hundred and seventy-eight before *Christ*. Some think, because many Words are *there* found in the *Alexandrian* Dialect, *therefore* it was the Work of the *Alexandrian* *Jews*: But others deny this Consequence; who say, that the *Greek* spoken at *Jerusalem*, was the *Alexandrian* *Greek*; consequently that had this Translation been made by the *Jews* of *Jerusalem*, as they suppose it was, this *Dialect* had been *also* used. Be this as it may: It is more *pertinent* to our Purpose to repeat what I before remarked, That many *Greek* Words are used by the Translators in a Sense *peculiar* to themselves; and to add, That the *same* *Hebrew* Words and Phrases are *differently* translated by them in *different* Places: That from this Difference of the *Style* in different Books, it hath been justly concluded, different Parts of the Bible were translated by *different* Persons: That the Translators of the *Prophetical* Books, and of the *Psalms*, seem more intent upon giving the *Sense* of the Text, than a *literal* Version: And lastly, that this Liberty is sometimes taken in all other Places too,

E

where

where the Translators judged it necessary. *Necessary*, I say; because, when these sacred Oracles, which had hitherto been carefully kept in *their own Hands*, were now to be made *public*, and submitted to the *Perusal* and *Animadversion* of a People, at that Time the most *polite* and *learned* upon the Face of the Earth; *Prudence* would direct the *Jews* to *guard* them, as much as it was possible, from every unreasonable *Cavil* and *Objection*. To this End, those *Hebrew* Terms and Phrases, which being *literally* translated would appear *harsh* or *low*, were to be *explained* and *softened*: Words of a *loose* and *undetermined* Meaning, to be *fixed*: The *bold* and *sublime* Metaphors of the *Hebrew* Language, to be *lowered* to the Standard of human Compositions; and every *groundless* Prejudice, which the *Gentiles* had conceived either against the *Jews* or their *Religion*, to be *discountenanced*. These were, I say, *prudent* Precautions, as far as they were *consistent* with Truth and Fidelity. But, be the Motives what they may, such a *Liberty* was certainly taken by the *Greek* Interpreters: And from it I conclude, that little Use can be made of this Version against the *Authority* of the present *Hebrew* Reading; since, where the Translation is so *loose*, it is hard to determine, what the Copy, from which it was taken, did *really* exhibit.

III. The

III. The *Chaldee* Paraphrases, or *Targums*, were drawn up with quite *another* View, and altogether for *another* Purpose. For the Design of these was to instruct *their own* People in the Knowledge of the Scriptures; the *Hebrew* Copies of which, after their Return from *Babylon*, they could not *read*, nor *understand* when they were read to them; the *Chaldee* being then the common Language of the *Jews*. Hence arose a Custom in the Time of *Ezra*, which afterwards continued, that when the Minister had read to the People, in the Synagogue on the Sabbath-Day, one Verse (of the Portion of Scripture, appointed to be read) in *Hebrew*; another standing by afterwards rendered it into *Chaldee*. So that these *Targums* were in truth nothing else, but Renditions of the *Hebrew* Text in a Language understood by the People: And for this Purpose it was proper they should be a *literal* Version of the *Hebrew*, Word for Word.

Of this Sort, is the *Targum* of *Onkelos* on the Law; which is an *accurate* and *literal* Translation of the *Hebrew Text*: whereas that of *Jonathan* is more *lax* and *paraphrastical*: Moreover, the Style of the former approaches nearest to the Standard of the *purest Chaldee* Language; whereas that of *Jonathan* is more *corrupt*. The *Difference* between those two learned Expositors, in these two *material* Circumstances, might induce us to suppose,

that they were not *Cotemporaries*, as it is said they were. However this be, it is generally thought, they both flourish'd about the Time of our Saviour's Birth. For we cannot place *Jonathan* so low, as the Time of the *Apostles*, where Mr. *Ainsworth* places him; because, after our Saviour's Appearance, the *Jerusalem Chaldee*, was *mixed* (as we find also the *Greek* was too) with a Number of *exotic* Words; of which the *Targum* of *Jonathan* is clear. Now these *Targums*, more especially the *Targum* of *Onkelas*, being a literal Translation, may be of singular Service to a learned Enquirer, in comparing them with the *Hebrew* Text; not only as they will shew him in what *Sense* the most learned Rabbis understood it; but also as they may help him to recover such Significations of the *Hebrew* Words, as now are lost.

But, whereas you are perpetually blaming the *English* Translators with too closely following the *Chaldee* Paraphrast on the *Psalms*, it may not be amiss to examine what good Cause you have for so doing. The Author of this *Targum* was *Joseph* the *One-ey'd*: But *who* this *Joseph* was, and *when* he lived, is not said. His Language is the *corruptest Chaldee* of the *Jerusalem Dialect*: A Token that he flourished long after the two other famous Expositors: And if your Observation of *Psal.*

* See his Annot. on *Numb.* xxiv. 19.

lxxxiii. 6^a. (where, you note, this *Targum* translates the Word *Hagarenes*, *Hungarians*;) be justly grounded; and this Reading be the Author's own *Translation*, and not the *Error* of the Transcriber or Printer, we must bring him down to a much lower Date. But if nothing more can be alledged against *Joseph's Targum*, than that it is more *modern* than many others; and written in the *corruptest Chaldee*; it doth not follow from hence, that our Translators did *wrong*, in preferring his Sense to *that* of the other Versions: Since this Point must be determined by the Authority of the *Hebrew Text*. And, since it appears from your Notes, that this *Chaldee Paraphrase* most commonly translates in a Sense, which best suits with the *present Hebrew Reading*; our Translators did *right* in following that, and deserting the *other Versions*: And the two obvious Inferences deducible from hence are, First, that the *Hebrew Copy*, which *Joseph* used, did, in all those Texts, *agree* with that, from whence our Translation was taken: And, Secondly, That therein both *Joseph*, and our Translators translated the Copies they had, *faithfully* and *truly*. If the *Hebrew Copies*, from which their Translations were

^a Bochart, who has also made the like Observation, adds, that the *Syriac* and *Arabic Versions* instead of *Hagarenes* read *Gadarenes*. "Syrus & Arabs *Risiana Editionis* perperam habent *Gadarenos*; sed *Chaldeus* multo absurdius *Hungaros*." *Phalag.* L. iv. c. 11.

made,

made, were *faulty* Copies, the Translators are no ways concerned in this Charge: Since it was incumbent on them, to render the Copies *just* as they found them; and they had been *justly blamed*, if they had presumed to frame their Translations to the Sense of the Versions, in Opposition to the *Hebrew* Text. There lies therefore no *material* Objection to *Joseph's Paraphrase*, that I can discover: And, let me add, that, when you say *ALL* the other Versions differ from the *Chaldee*, it should be remembred, you in fact oppose only *two* Authorities against *this*; since the *other* Versions, excepting the *Syriac*, as I said before, must be reduced to the single Authority of the *Seventy's Version*.

IV. The *Syriac* Version, whose Antiquity hath been sometimes laid as *high* as the Days of *Solomon*, must, I believe, be considered in the *last* Place. For, tho' it be confessed to be very *antient*; yet is it supposed to have been made within the *first* Century after *Christ*, and not *before*. What is much more to our present Enquiry is that, which follows: " It
 " had for it's Author, some Christian of the
 " *Jewish* Nation, who was thoroughly skilled
 " in *both* Languages, the *Hebrew* and the
 " *Syriac*. For it is very *accurately* done, and
 " expresseth the Sense of the Original with
 " greater Exactness, than any other Version,
 " which hath been made of the Scriptures, at
 " any Time before the Revival of Learning
 " in

“ in these last Ages.” The Observation, that naturally results from this Account, is made by the most learned Author in the following Words; “ Therefore of all the antient Versions, which are now consulted by Christians for the better understanding of the Holy Scriptures, as well of the *New Testament* as of the *Old*^a, none can better serve this End, than this old *Syriac* Version, when carefully consulted, and well understood. And to this Purpose, the very *Nature* of the Language much helpeth; for it having been the Mother Tongue of those, who wrote the *New Testament*, and a Dialect of that, in which the *Old* was first given unto us, many Things of both are more *happily* expressed in it through this whole Version, than can well be done in any other Language.”

Upon the whole then; a diligent Study of the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, and of the *Seventy's*, and *Syriac* Versions, may enable the judicious Scholar to throw great Light on the obscure and difficult Passages of Scripture: But I much doubt, whether these Versions will alone, on any Occasion, fully warrant him to

^a Mr. N. Fuller, recommends the *Syriac* Language, for the better understanding of the *Seventy's* Version also: “ Facile animadvertat Lector diligens, receptum esse LXX. Interpretibus morem, *Hebræa* multa vocabula vertendi, ex vernaculâ potius *Syriaci* idiomatis consuetudine, quam *Hebræi*.” Misc. L. vii. c. i. p. 48.

alter the present Reading of the *Hebrew Text*. In detecting those Errors, that are crept into the *Hebrew Copies*, the first Thing to be done is, to *examine* the various Editions and MSS. of the *Hebrew Bible*. And a careful *Collation* of these, after the Plan of the learned *Mill's Edition* of the *New Testament*, might now and then amend the present Reading: Thus for Instance, the *Hebrew Copy* printed in *St. Hierom's Works*, at *Psal. xvi. 2.* instead of אָמַרְתָּ thou hast said, reads אָמַרְתִּי, I have said, agreeably to all the Versions: And so *St. Hierom* read it, having translated it *dixi*. But, I am inclined to think that the Variations of the *Hebrew Copies*, would be then found as *immaterial*, as those are, which have been collated on the *New Testament*: And I humbly conceive, that the present Poverty of the *Hebrew Language*, and the want of suitable Means of understanding the full Force and Power of the *Hebrew Words*, are the principal Causes, that many Passages, in those sacred Oracles, are difficult and obscure.

OBJECTION.

OBJECTION II.

“ You have not duly considered the Liberty,
 “ which the Seventy take, in their Tran-
 “ slation of the *Hebrew* Text ; and often
 “ suppose a *Difference* between these two,
 “ where there is *none*.

THIS Objection, tho’ *seemingly* laid against the Seventy’s Version in *particular*, yet really concerns *all* the other Versions also, that are *taken* from the Seventy’s : And as the Observations, to be hereafter alleged in Proof of this Objection, will be chiefly taken from the *Psalms* ; it should be remembered, that, when the Seventy are reconciled to the present Reading of the *Hebrew* Text, and the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, there will remain only one Authority, *viz.* The *Syriac* Version, *against* it.—I have already *specified*, what those *Liberties* are, which the Seventy *take* in translating the *Hebrew* Text, and shall now *apply* them, in Order, to your *Notes*.

I. *The Seventy do not always give a precise, grammatical Construction of the Hebrew Words.* I have already produced two Instances of this Sort from your Notes on *Gen.* xlix. 10. and *Psal.* l. 5. To which I shall subjoin the following, taken from your Note on *Psal.* xi. 3. where you say, “ Here too the
 F “ *Chaldee*

“ *Chaldee has missed our Translators to a*
 “ *new Reading and a new Sense, unknown to*
 “ *all the oldest Interpreters, who rendered*
 “ *the Words in this Manner, For what thou*
 “ *didst place, they have destroyed. Hence*
 “ *you suppose, the old Interpreters read for*
 “ *השתת Foundations תשתית in Hiphil, thou*
 “ *didst place.”* But there is no Occasion to
 suppose a various Reading in the Passage be-
 fore us. For what Difference is there in
Sense, between *Foundations*, and, *what thou*
hast laid, or placed? The Seventy here do
 not translate the *Hebrew Substantive* in a pre-
 cise, grammatical Construction, but by a *Verb*
 and *Pronoun*; as they have rendered it in
 another Place, *Isai. xix. 10.* by a *Parti-*
ciple and Pronoun, שתות, *οἱ διαλογιζόμενοι*
αὐτά. The *Foundations* here meant, are the
Rulers and Governors of civil Community;
 who are styled by *this Appellation*, again,
Psal. lxxii. 5. Now as the civil Powers are
 the *Institution and Ordinance of God*, the
 Seventy here pertinently render the *Hebrew*
 Word by ἀκατήλωσα, *what thou hast or-*
dained.

II. *The Seventy fix the Hebrew Word,*
whose Sense is loose and undetermined, to a more
confined, and particular Acceptation. Thus,
 when they render ברנש *Psal. lv. 14.* in *Con-*
cord, or Friendship, I suppose, they intended
 to restrain the *general Meaning* of the *He-*
brew Word, to a *particular and clearer*
 Sense;

Sense ; and such as best suited the Design of the *Psalmist*. For to walk into the House of God with a *Multitude*, or *Tumult*, implies, that the whole Congregation there met, is in *one* and the *same* Mind, to join in the same Act of Devotion. The *being*, or *conforting* together implies *Unanimity* and *Consent* ; for which Reason the Seventy render the Words יחד and יחדו together, either by ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ in *Concord* or *Friendship*, as *Psal.* lxxxiii. 6. (where it is redundant, and joined with ἐπι-
ταυτοῖ) or by ὁμοθυμαδὸν, as *Job.* iii. 18. Hence also *Hesychius* expounds κατ' αὐτὸ together, by ὡσεὶ ὁμονοῦντες, as *agreeing*. There is therefore no Occasion for altering the *Hebrew* Text, or changing ברגש into ברצון.

By this Rule also I account for the Seventy's Version, of *Psal.* xxix. 2. with a *holy* *Worship*, by, in the Court of Holiness, i.e. the Court of the Temple. For the *Worship*, which the *Psalmist* here exhorts the *Israelites* to pay, must be the Acts of *public* *Worship* ; since he calls upon them to bring young *Rams* unto the Lord ; which were always slain in the Courts of the Temple. And it is observable, that the *Hebrew* Words בהדרת קדש, which are thrice translated ἐν ἀγίᾳ ἁγία, by the Seventy, are then always used by the *Psalmist* to denote an Act of *public* *Worship* ; as in *Psal.* xxix. 2. before mentioned ; and again, *Psal.* xcvi. 9. and 1 *Chron.* xvi. 29. which Ode was composed by *David*,

upon fixing the *Ark of God* in the new *Tabernacle*; and consequently, the *Worship* he encourages the *People* to perform, must be the public *Worship* of the *Tabernacle*. In short, the *Sense* and *Import* of the *Hebrew Words* before us must needs have been so familiar to, and well understood by these antient *Interpreters*, that we cannot suppose they would have translated them three Times in the same Words, unless they had intended to fix their general Meaning by a restrained and clearer Acceptation^a.

Once more; on *Psal. viii. 2.* where our Translators render the *Hebrew Words*, *Hast thou ordained Strength*, you note, "It is not easy to excuse our Translators here for following the *Chaldee*, in Opposition to all the antient *Interpreters*, and to *St. Matthew's* Quotation of this Text in the Words of the *Greek Version*, by which *קִרְיָת עֹז* is rendered *thou hast perfected Praise*." Here you own the *Seventy* render the *Hebrew Word קִרְיָת* (which either signifies *Strength*, or *Praise*^b, but most generally the former,)

^a The Masculine Noun *בְּהָרִי קִרְיָת* *Psal. cx. 3.* is rendered by *Buxtorf*; "in decoris, viz. *Locis Sanctis* tatis."

^b I observe that the *Greek κρείττο*, *Strength*, signifies *Praise*, and is interpreted by *Hesychius* both by *ἰσχυρὸς* and *δοξα*. So *Homer Il. N. 486.* it signifies *Praise* or *Glory*,

— *φίσιλο μέγα κρείττο*.

in it's more *particular* and restrained Sense. Our Translators translate it in it's more *usual* and *common* Acceptation; and, I think, may be well *excused*, for the two following Reasons. First, because the Words, *Thou hast ordained Strength*, carry with them as *significant* and *sublime* a Meaning, as these, *Thou hast perfected Praise*. And so the Compilers of the Liturgy thought, who in the Collect (if it be their *own* Composition, and not St. Gregory's, as many of the Collects are) for *Innocent's* Day, have transcribed these Words; where they convey so plain and excellent a Sense, that, I believe, my Reader will think our Translators want no Excuse for the Translation they give; "O Lord, who out of the
 "Mouths of Babes and Sucklings hast ordain-
 "ed Strength, and made'st Infants to glorify
 "thee by their Deaths," &c. And this Expression is also justified by another of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 9. "My Strength is made perfect
 "in Weakness." Secondly, because, since the *two-fold* Sense of the *Hebrew* *is* is applicable to the *Psalmist's* Meaning, it was not fit that *either* should be lost; and our Translators judged right in preserving *both*.

3. *The Seventy sometimes soften the bold Metaphors of the Hebrew Language, and explain Symbolical Terms.* The *Psalmist*, by a strong, yet pertinent Figure, styles the Tongue כבוד the Glory of Man, three Times, *Psal.* xvi. 9. as you remark, and xxx. 13. and lvii.

lviii. 9. And St. *James* tells us, c. iii. 9. in Allusion, without Doubt, to this known Metaphor among the *Hebrews*, that the Tongue is that, *wherewith we bless God*. Hence *Buxtorf* informs us, that the Rabbis explain the *Hebrew Word* in the above-cited *Psalms* by *Tongue*, because it is *the Instrument of Praise*. It doth not appear to me therefore, “ that the antient Interpreters, or St. *Peter*, “ did read, at *Psal. xvi. 9.* לשוני *my Tongue*, “ or that this Word carries a much plainer “ Sense, than *my Glory*, or is preferable to “ it.” For in affirming this, I should argue against the determinate Use of the *Hebrew Language*.

Again you allow, “ That the antient *Trans-* “ *lators*, as well as *Aben Ezra* and *Kimchi*, “ printed in the *Polyglot*, agree with the *Chal-* “ *dee* in rendering מנני *Psal. xlvii. 9.* not the “ *Shields*, but the *potent Men*” of the Earth; and add, “ that if they meant hereby to ex- “ plain *Shields*, the Metaphor is not easy.” Here you again dispute, against the best Authority, the *Force* and *Genius* of the *Hebrew Language*. But the Sense here given by the Translators to the *Hebrew Word*, is not singular: You have another Instance, *Hosea iv. 18.* where it is used, and explained in the same Manner. For there the Words מנניה i. e. “ her *Shields* with Shame do love,” are in the *English Version* translated, “ Her *Rulers* with “ Shame,” &c. And *Buxtorf* acquaints us, that

that the *Hebrew* Word in this Place stands for *Proteſtores*. Neither the *Versions*, therefore, nor the *Senſe* here, warrant us to diſplace the preſent Reading; ſince the Meaning is as good, if we ſay, *the Rulers of the Earth are God's*; as, *the Territories of the Earth are his*.

Once more; you plead for changing עקבי, *Pſal. xlix. 5: The Wickedneſs of my Heels compaſſeth me round about*, into איני, *the Wickedneſs of my Enemies*. I will offer at an Explanation of this Verſe, preſerving the Text, as it now ſtands; by the Aſſiſtance of an Explication, which you may find in *Heſychius*, of the Symbolical Term, Πιέπωνς, uſed here by the Seventy for עקבי. That *Lexicographer*, who was a diligent Reader of the Seventy's Verſion, hath explained many of their figurative Renditions in their proper Senſe; and interprets Πιέπωνς (ſet down in this oblique Caſe; which induces me to believe he had Reſpect to the Paſſage now before us) τῆς πορείας τῆς βίῃς, *the Goings or Behaviour of Life*^a. In which Senſe, *the Wickedneſs of my Heels* will mean, *the Wickedneſs of my paſt Life*. The Deſign of the *Pſalm* is not, as you ſeem to imagine, a Com-

^a So *H. Stephens*, Πορεύων in *S. Literis* dicuntur, ut ai 'Odol pro Vitæ Inſtitutum, ſeu Facta ejus vel recta vel prava; and cites *James i. 11*. In the ſame Senſe the *Hebrew* עקבי is tranſlated in our *Engliſh* Verſion at *Pſal. lvi. 7*. they watch my *Heels*, they mark my *Steps*.

plaint of the Psalmist against the Iniquity of his *Enemies* ; but to convey some general Reflexions on the *Vanity* and *Uncertainty* of Life ; and it contains a most excellent *Persuasive* to an early Application of the Mind to *Wisdom*. Now let us consider the Context. “ *My Mouth shall speak of Wisdom ;* “ *and my Heart shall muse of Understanding ;* “ *I will incline my Ear to the Parable, and* “ *shew my dark Speech upon the Harp,*” *i. e.* I will in the Days of my Youth apply myself diligently to the Acquisition of Wisdom, and submit myself to the Direction of able and faithful Counsellors ; for “ *why should I* “ *fear in the evil Days, i. e. in my old Age,* “ *and when the Wickedness of my Heels com-* “ *passeth me round about ?*” *Why should I* *fear ? i. e.* Why should I so behave now, as to fear hereafter, and aggravate the Sorrows of old Age, with sad Reflexions on the past *Misconduct* of my Youth. And then it follows, I see that the Rich, the Wise, and the Mighty die as well as the Ignorant and Foolish ; since this therefore is the Fate of all, I will endeavour to make my *Departure* as happy as I can ; my Heart shall now muse of Understanding ; I will now incline my Ear to the Parable, to the wholesome Instructions of wise Men.

4. *The Seventy sometimes illustrate and explain the Hebrew Phrases in a proper Sense.* I need not premise, That *Phrases*, and *Pro-*
verbial

verbial Expressions, when translated *literally* from their own *native* Language into another, will often sound *low*, *trifling* and *ridiculous* : To avoid which, these antient *Greek* Interpreters may be observed to give sometimes an *Interpretation* of the *Hebrew* Phrase, instead of a *literal* Translation. I wish this Rule had always been followed in our *English* Version ; and a literal Translation of the *Hebrew* Phrase added in the Margin. For I am of your Opinion, that *put my Tears into thy Bottle*, *Psal.* lvi. 8. is a *low* and *vulgar* Expression ; too unbecoming the *solemn* Occasion of a *devout* Prayer and Address to *God*. But I cannot with you “ suspect the “ *Reading* of the Text ;” notwithstanding it is not supported by any of the antient Interpreters, beside the *Chaldee*. I believe *put these Things into thy Bottle* was a usual Form of Speech among the *Hebrews*, to denote the *preserving* or *keeping* of them together. And, tho’ I cannot produce a Proof of this, that may appear *home* to the Point, yet I have one at Hand, that will not be judged altogether *foreign* to the Purpose. It is taken from *Psal.* xxxiii. 7. where instead of, “ *He ga-* “ *thereth the Waters of the Sea together as it* “ *were upon a Heap*, the *Seventy* render it, *as a Bottle*^a, as if they had read כנאך instead

as

^a But I must observe, the *Seventy* seem mistaken in translating the *Hebrew* Word וַיַּגְדֹּם in the Accusative

of כִּנֹּר. Now if this was *not* the true Reading, yet the Translation of the Seventy proves, that such a Phrase was in use among them. If it *was*, it will signify, that God has *confined* and *kept* together that boistrous Element within the Compass he hath *set* to it: and *fixed* to it its Bounds, which it cannot *pass*, nor *flow* abroad, and *overwhelm* the Earth; thus it will be a *Comment* to the other Passage in *Psal.* lvi. 8. and the *Sense* there will be,
 “ As thou countest the Number of my Wand-
 “ rings, so I beseech thee, let not the Tears
 “ I shed in my Distress, *fall* to the Ground
 “ and *perish*; but *preserve* them in thy
 “ keeping, as a *Memorial* of my Sufferings.”
 There is an Expression in *Job* something similar to this, at least of the same Import, which occurs also in other Places of Scripture. My *Transgression is sealed up in a Bag*; and thou sewest up my *Iniquity*. c. xiv. 17. *Schultens* perhaps will give you a good Account of this *latter* form of Speech in his Paraphrase on *Job*; but we of this Nation have the less Reason to object to the *former*,

tive Case, and not *ὡς ἀνδρῶν*. For as כִּנֹּר follows כִּנֹּס, it stands in the Place of the Nominative Case; כִּנֹּס כִּנֹּר מִהֶם.

בְּצִרּוֹר, in *Marfupio*. These Purses and Bottles, I suppose, were made of Leather (See *Hag.* i. 6. *He that earneth Wages, earneth Wages to put it into a Bag with Holes.*) To seal up in a Bag, therefore, and to put into a Bottle, are Expressions which have a near *Affinity* to each other.

since

since we vulgarly use the Verb, to *bottle* or *bottle up*, for the very same Purpose ^a.

Again, to *eat*, or to *eat Bread together*, is a Phrase, or Idiom of Speech, which hath been in Use from the earliest Times, for an Act of *Friendship*, *Trust*, and *Confidence*. So upon a Reconciliation made between *Isaac* and *Abimelech*, *Gen. xxvi. 30.* and between *Jacob* and *Laban*, *Gen. xxxi. 54.* the two Parties ate Bread together, as a Token, that they parted from one another in *Peace* and *Friendship*. And when the *Psalmist* describes the Treachery of his intimate and bosom Friend, he tells us he was one, who did *also eat of his Bread*: *Yea, even mine own familiar Friend, who did also eat of my Bread, hath laid great wait for me. Psal. xli. 10.* Which Words may perhaps determine the Sense of another Expression, that occurs in *Psal. lxix. 23. Let their Table^b be made a Snare to take them*

^a The last Clause of the Verse is this, *Are not these Things noted in thy Book?* Which Words are an Explication of the foregoing Phrase; and are parallel to the following Expression of *Æschylus* in his *Eumenides*,

Ἄδης Δειλογέσθω πᾶσι ἱστοῖα φρενί.
which the Scholiast thus interprets, Ἐφορᾷ πάντα, ἀναλεσφόδωρ αὐτὰ τῇ ἰδίᾳ δέλω.

^b I omit to take Notice, that to *eat Salt* with another was symbolically used by the Antients for an Act of *Intimacy* and *Friendship*. But it may not be amiss to observe, that the Word *τράπεζα*, *Table*, was also figuratively used

themselves withall, i.e. may those who eat of their Bread, prove *insidious* and *unfaithful* to them. Now we cannot be surprized, if the Seventy, attending to the Import of the Word נִמְתִּיק in *Psal.* liv. 12. (a Word often used of *Meats and Drinks*) translate the *Hebrew Word*, we *sweetened* our *Counsel together*, by, we *sweetened* our *Food together*: Especially, if we remember, that the *Hebrew Words*, *Psal.* cxli. 4. which in our Translation are rendered, *lest I eat*, אֲנִי אֶכְלֶה, of *such Things as please them*, are by them translated, μὴ συνδύσω^a μετὰ τῶν ἑκλεκτῶν αὐτῶν, *lest I take Counsel*, or; *communicate* with their chief and principal Men. From these two Instances it appears, that to *eat*, or *consult* together were *synonymous Expressions* in the Judgment of the Seventy.

5. The *Seventy paraphrase*, when a *literal Translation* might also favour any *groundless Cavil* or *Exception* against their Religion. And in so doing, they acquitted themselves, as faithful *Expositors*; by vindicating the *Scriptures* from *Misinterpretation*. Under

used in the same Sense, and denoted *Hospitality*, *Confidence*, and *Friendship*. So *Parius Jamb.* ap. *Origenem* L. ii. p. 74.

Ἄλλοι δὲ ἐνοσφίσθης μέγα,

Ἄλλος τε καὶ τραπέζαν

And *Hesychius* renders τραπέζην Πάρεν, τὸν παραβάντα τράπεζαν, *He that transgressed the Table*, i. e. broke the *Laws of Hospitality* and *Friendship*.

^a Συνδύαζεν, συμπράττειν, συμβουλευεσθαι. *Hesych.*

this

this Head I place your Notes on *Ex. xv. 3.* and *Psal. xxiv. 6.* For if, in the *former* Text they had rendered the *Hebrew* Words, according to their literal Meaning, *the Lord is a Man of War*; or, in the latter, *this is the Generation of them that seek him*, [*viz. the Lord*] *even of them that seek thy Face, O Jacob*: It is easy to conceive, that the subtle Philosophers of *Greece* would have retorted upon the *Jews* the Charge of *Dæmon-Worship*; and the Translators had brought a *Slander* on their Religion, which it did not deserve. These Misinterpretations therefore were to be guarded against; and it seems probable, that the *Seventy* used this Precaution with such a Design; because they have translated this, and other like bold Expressions of the *Hebrew* Language in the *same* wary Manner, in other Places. Thus *Isai. xlii. 13.* יהוה באיש מלחמה *the Lord, as a Man of War*, is rendered by them in the very *same* Words as in *Ex. xv. 3.* συντρίψει πολέμους: And גבור מלחמה *Psal. xxiv. 8.* which properly signifies *a mighty Man*, or, *mighty one of Battle*, is by them translated δυνατὸς ἐν πολέμῳ, *mighty in Battle*. For גבור is here used *substantively*, as it elsewhere ^a is; and therefore is an Expression, tho' not so *barsh*, perhaps, as the other, yet conveying the same

^a *I Chron. v. 24.* גבורי חיל, and again in *Chaldee, Dan. iii. 20.* In both Places it is put in the Regimen, as the former of two Substantives.

Idea and Meaning. And for the same Reason I am induced to think, they would not suffer the other Text *Psal. xxiv. 6.* to pass without some *Explication*, where the Name of *Jehovah* is indirectly attributed to *Jacob*; supposing their *Hebrew Copies* *did* read, as ours now do. And I am inclined to think that they *did*; since *Justin Martyr* tells *Trypho* three Times^a, that the *Messiah* is called in the Writings of the Prophets by the Name of *Jacob*. Now this *Psalms* containing manifestly a *Prediction* of the *Messiah*, was one of those Places, I suppose, which *Justin* alludes to: Or if it was not, since this *Appellation* was given to the *Messias* in other Places; why may not the same Reading be permitted to keep it's Place in *this Psalm*? The *Messiah* is expressly called *David* in many different^b Passages of the Prophets; why then should it be thought *absurd* to call him also *Jacob*? The *Sense*, intended to be conveyed by these *Appellations*, is evidently this, that the *Messiah*, who is in the Context declared to be the supreme *God*, *Jehovah*, should hereafter take upon him the Nature of *Man*, and become the Son of *Jacob*, of the House of *David*: And these *two* Appellations, attributed to him, denote the *Union* of the *God-*

^a P. ci. 117. and 125.

^b Jer. xxx. 9. Ezek. xxxiv. 23. and xxxvii. 24. Hof. iii. 5.

head and *Manhood* in his Person. We must not therefore, for I know not *what* Authority, (tho' you are pleased to style it, that of the *best* antient Translators ; whereas the *whole* Amount of these *sinks* into the Authority of the *Seventy's* Version, which I have attempted to account for, and the *Syriac*) we must not, I say, on such *slight* Motives, give up a Reading of the *Hebrew* Text, supported, as this is, by the Attestation of a Primitive Writer of the *Christian* Church ; when the *Meaning* it conveys is authorized by other Passages of Scripture ; and hath been transmitted to us from the earliest Ages, as a *Catholic* Doctrine.

6. And *Lastly*, *The Seventy use some Greek Words in a Sense peculiar to themselves.* *Ψυχή* the *Soul* is used by the *Seventy*, according to the Import of the *Hebrew* *שֵׁנָה*, either for *Anima Vivens*, the living *Soul* as it is distinct from the *Spirit*, or the *immaterial* and *immortal* Part of Man ; or for the *Anima Concupiscens*, the carnal *Desires* and *Affections*. In the *first* of these Senses it is to be taken, *Psal.* xxii. 30. " *All they that go down into the*
" Dust shall kneel before him, and no Man
" hath quickened his own Soul," i. e. hath given Life unto himself, or can deliver himself from Death : Which Sense is more agreeable to the Context, than that which *L. Capel* recommends. For I do not conceive the Connection of his Translation, *My Soul*
 2 *shall*

shall live to him either with the preceding Words, *All they that go down into the Dust shall kneel before him*; or with those that follow, *My Seed shall serve him*. In this Sense indeed the Greek *ψυχή* is used often by good Classics: But not by them, I presume, in the other Sense, for the sensual Appetites and Desires, especially those of *eating and drinking*. Yet *נפש* is known to signify these; and *נפש בעל* Prov. xxiii. 2. is translated by the Seventy, *ἄπλησότες*, *too greedy of Meats, &c.* and by our Translators, *a Man given to Appetite*. In which Sense, *ψυχή* also is used by the Seventy in Prov. xxiii. ult. where, *The righteous eateth to the satisfying of the Soul, but the Belly of the Wicked shall want*; the Seventy render the Hebrew *בטן* Belly in the latter Clause by *ψυχαί*, as it is plain also that in the former Clause the satisfying of the Soul, means the satisfying of the Belly. So that the Words of Psal. xlix. 19. may be thus translated, *while he lived his Soul blessed him; and as long as thou indulgest thy self, it (or, thy Soul) will bless thee*: the Hebrew Verb *נפש* being often applied to Acts of sensual Gratification.

Once more, and to conclude this Objection. On Psal. cxxxix. 13. “*My Reins are thine*”, you remark, “one may perhaps without Partiality prefer the Reading of the Syriac and Arabic *תקנית* thou hast composed, or created, instead of the pre-
“ sent

sent Hebrew כָּנִי, thou hast possessed. And
 " if this be the true Reading the Greek ἐκτίσας,
 " thou hast possessed, may be as easily turned in-
 " to ἐκτίσας, thou hast created." Dr. Grabe
 informs us^a, that having observed the Hebrew
 כָּנִי at Psal. ciii. 24. to be translated by the
 Seventy κτίσας, he suspected it to be an Error
 of the Alexandrian Copy: But that, finding
 this Reading was confirmed by all the other
 Editions of the Greek Version, and the He-
 brew כָּנִי at Prov. viii. 22. rendered there
 also by ἐκτίσας, he was unwilling totally to
 abolish κτίσας, and having removed it to the
 Margin, substituted κτήσας into the Text.
 Here I cannot forbear taking Notice, how very
 different the Method was, which this most
 learned and judicious Editor took, in compa-
 ring this antient Version with the Hebrew
 Text, from that which L. Capel pursued.
 The former, on slight Occasions, we see, al-
 ters the Seventy's Version to the present Read-
 ing of the Hebrew Copy; the latter alters
 the Hebrew Text to the Readings of the
 Versions. But to return: With Submission to
 so great an Authority, the learned Editor hath
 here shewn himself over nice and scrupulous; as
 he hath also upon some other^b Occasions. For
 the

^a Prol. ad Psalm. c. ii. § 6.

^b At Ex. xviii 4. Dr. Grabe hath removed the Word
 χειρὸς, and substituted μαχαίρας, because the Hebrew Copy
 reads כֶּרֶב, a Sword. But, God hath delivered me out
 of the Hand or Power of Pharaoh, is the same Thing, as
 from the Sword of Pharaoh. Again at Psal. lxxii. 14.
 Dear shall their Blood be in his Sight, which the Seventy

the *Hebrew* קנָה signifies to *make, create and beget*, as well as to *possess*. Thus *Gen.* xiv. 19. and 22. קוֹנֵה is rightly translated by us, who *made* Heaven and Earth. And *Zech.* xiii. 5. the *Seventy* render it by ἐγέννησεν, *he begat*. In the same Sense the *Seventy* use the *Greek* κτάνω, attributing to that, according to their Manner, the *twofold* Meaning of the *Hebrew* קנָה, and using it for *creating or begetting*, as well as for *possessing*. For besides the Places before-mentioned, at *Prov.* xvii. 21. where it is said, *He that begetteth a Fool, יִלֵּד*, the *Seventy* translate τῷ κερτημένῳ². There is no Occasion therefore to alter the present Reading either of the *Hebrew* Text, or of the *Greek* Version, in the Passage now before us; since *each* of them will bear the Sense you seem to prefer, and may be translated, *thou hast composed, or created*.

render, *dear shall their Name be*, &c. there is no Reason to suppose the *Seventy* read דָּם instead of דָּבָר, since both these *symbolical* Terms, *blood* and *name* signify, a *People, Race, Posterity*. Thus *Nomen Latinum, Volscum*, &c. is often used by *Livy*.

^a The *Seventy* are not singular, however, in giving the Sense of *begetting* to the *Greek* κτάνω, for *Sophocles* thus uses it in his *Oedipus Tyr.* Πατρὸς, — ἐξ ἰσῶν ἐκλήσασθ' ὑμᾶς.

* 1497.

OBJECTION

OBJECTION III.

“ A *seeming* Difference, between the *Hebrew* Text and the Versions, may be
 “ sometimes removed, by the Assistance
 “ of the other *Eastern* Languages : This
 “ also you have not duly considered.”

IT is very evident from your Critical Notes, that you, Sir, are not at all insensible of the great *Use*, which may be made of the *Dialects*, both in *enriching* the present Poverty of the *Hebrew* Language, and also in *explaining* Scripture. And had your Enquiries been directed this Way, you had solved many of the Difficulties, which you have raised, as will appear from the following short Specimen, I am about to give.

On *Gen. vi. 3.* *My Spirit shall not always strive with Man*, you note, that all the antient versions “ furnish us with something
 “ more intelligible, shall not *remain* or *continue* : By which it appeared to *L. Capel*, that
 “ *their* Reading then was *לִין* instead of *דִּין*.” I was induced to believe, that the *Hebrew* *לִין* in some of the neighbouring Languages signifies to *abide*, *expect*, or *wait for*, from the Blessing, which *Jacob* on his Death-bed gives to his Son *Dan*. For it hath been shewn, that the Blessing the Patriarch gives his twelve Sons, is founded on the various *Significations* of their respective *Names*; and in that bestowed on *Dan*, among other different

ferent Imports, this of *expecting*, &c. is found; I have waited for *thy Salvation*, O Lord. Upon further Enquiry, I am informed, "That the Arabic נָתַן denotes *toto animo*
 " & *cogitatione rei alicui deditus, seu affixus*
 " *fuit*. Or, if this be thought to fall short of
 " the Seventy's $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta$, the Arabic Verb נָתַן
 " will fully serve our Turn, signifying *consti-*
 " *tut, substitit, commoratus fuit*, &c; this in
 " *Hiphil* makes נָתַן or נָתַן , and is construed
 " with the Præposition בְּ , as the Hebrew
 " Verb here, in the Text before us, is." There
 is no Reason therefore to suppose a *various*
 Reading in this Place: And we may render
 the Word which way we please, *My Spirit*
shall not always strive, or abide with Man.

Gen. xxvii. 40. *It shall come to pass, when*
thou shalt have the Dominion, that thou shalt
break his Yoke from off thy Neck. It seems
 probable, that our Translators have not hit
 upon the right Sense of the Hebrew נָתַן ,
 rendering it, *thou shalt have the Dominion*.
 You allow, that Capel's Substitution of נָתַן ,
be shall rebel, in it's Room, "is a Correcti-
 " on, tho' ingenious, yet not necessary." And
 propose to keep the present Reading, giving
 it "another Sense, which the Word in the
 " Chaldee and Syriac has, and in which the
 " Syriac Version, and the Greek of Sym-
 " machus translate it, *when thou shalt be*
 " *reformed; or, amended.*" But I wish you had
 enquired, whether your Translation be sup-
 ported

ported by the Evidence of Scripture-History; and had from thence acquainted us, that the *Edomites*, at the Time of their *Revolt*, were at all amended or reformed, since their *Reduction* by *David*. For, if this Amendment be not warranted by History, your Translation must not be admitted; because it will advance a *Supposition*, for which we have no *Authority*. We must therefore look after some other Sense of the Word *תָּרַד*; and either of the two following will suit with the Sense of the Text, and the History of the *Edomites*; and the Preference is left to the Judgment of the Reader.

1. The Hebrew *תָּרַד* in *Hiphil* signifies to bewail or lament; and Mr. Ainsworth^a says, the Words before us may be rendered, "When thou shalt mourn, viz. for that hard Servitude, thou shalt break his Yoke from off thy Neck." This Sense Buxtorf also informs us, is given to the Text by others. Now Scripture, as well as *Josephus* acquaints us, that the *Edomites* had Cause to lament and bewail their Servitude. For *David*, having subdued them, put Garrisons into Edom; throughout all Edom put he Garrisons, 2 Sam. viii. 14. These Garrisons, no Doubt, were supported at the Expence of the *Edomites*: And to defray this Expence, as well as to raise besides an annual Tribute, *David*, says *Josephus*, levied a Tax not only upon the Land of the *Edomites*; but a Poll-

^a In locum.

*Tax too*¹. Lastly, all Power, both *military* and *civil*, was taken out of the Hands of the *Natives*, and given to a *Hebrew Deputy*, or *Vice-Roy*, 1 *Kings* xxii. 47. These were *Restraints* and *Burdens*, that could not fail of being very *irksome* to a *fierce* and *warlike* People, as the *Edomites* were; who were fated to *live by their Sword*; and had been accustomed to maintain themselves by *Spoil* and *Plunder*, and on the *Property* of their *Neighbours*.

2. " If the *Hebrew* רר be explained by " the *Arabic* رر, it will then signify, *re-* " *pulit, rejecit, he removed, or threw off.*" This Interpretation will best agree with the *Seventy's* καθελῆς, and so is recommended by the Authority of this *antient* Version. " The " *Arabic* Verb, in this Form, will make in " *Hiphil* רר, which is not very different " from רר, especially considering, that in " this Conjugation (.) and (י) are often used " for each other. Nay, רר itself in *Arabic* " signifies *mota fuit Res*; a Sense not very " distant from that of the *Seventy's*."

Psal. xx. 7, " We will remember, נזכיר, the *Name of the Lord our God.*" To what hath been already remarked on this Text, in *De-* *fence* of the present Reading, I shall add the following Observation. " The *Arabic* זכר " signifies, *bene se habere, incrementum capere,*

¹ Φόρος υπέρ τε τῆς χώρας, καὶ τῆς ἑκάστη κεφαλῆς παρ' αὐτῶν ἐδίδχτο. *Hist. Jud.* l. vii. c. 6.

* *augeri*; which Sense will best suit with the
 “ Word *μεγαλυνθήσμεθα*, *we will be great* ;” and
 consequently, if this be the *genuine* Reading
 of the *Seventy's* Version, there is no need to
 suppose any *Change* in the *Hebrew* Text.

Psal. liv. 14. *We walked in the House of*
God, *ברגש*, as *Friends*. To what hath been
 already said on these Words, I shall also sub-
 join the following Note. “ The proper No-
 “ tion of the Verb *רגש* seems to be, *to come*
 “ *together with Hurry and Confusion* ; as
 “ *Castell* observes the *Jews* were wont to do
 “ to their *Synagogue*: And the Noun *רגש* will
 “ signify a *Company of People*, so coming
 “ together. In *Syriac* the Word signifies *to*
 “ *agree and consent* ; in which Sense it is
 “ used, *Act.* v. 2. to denote the Agreement
 “ there was between *Ananias* and *Sapphira*,
 “ to keep back a Part of the Price of the
 “ Possession they had sold. Here we have
 “ the *ὁμόνοια* of the *Seventy*, and there is
 “ no Reason to think they read *differently*
 “ from the present Copy.”

Psal. lxviii. 4. *Magnify him that rideth*,
בערבות, upon the *Heavens*. Here you re-
 mark “ the *Hebrew* Word never signifies
 “ *Heavens*, in any other Place, but *Deserts*,
 “ or the *West* ; and is so translated by the
 “ *Greek* and *Syriac* ; to which the same Ver-
 “ sions make *ψ 33.* to answer by render-
 “ ing it, *to him that rideth upon the Heaven*
 “ *of Heavens towards the East*.—Now if the
 “ *moderns*

" Moderns will put *Heavens* in *Y. 4.* they
 " ought to have read עֲנָנִים *Clouds*, instead of
 " עֲרֵבִים *Deserts.*" The Hebrew עֲרֵבִים sig-
 nifies primarily *Locus campestris* or *campe-*
stria, an open, wide, extended Plain; and, as
 the Latin *Aequor*, is applicable to *Earth*,
Sea or *Sky*. The 33^d verse determined our
 Translators, I suppose, to fix it to the last
 Sense: And in so doing, they are supported,
 not only by *D. Kimchi*, but also by *Maimo-*
nides, *Aben Ezra*, *Elieser*, as they are cited
 in *Buxtorf*. " But there cannot be given a
 " better Account of this Word, than what you
 " have in *Dr. Hammond's* Note on the Place;
 " which is as follows: עֲרֵבִים in the Plural is
 " is acknowledged by the *Hebrews* to signify
 " the *Heavens*: And so in *Arabic* عَرَبٌ,
 " *Heaven*, and peculiarly the *Seventh Hea-*
 " *ven*. This, *Abulvalid* saith, belongs to
 " the *Heavens*, by Reason of their *Height*
 " and *Supereminency*. Thus far *Dr. Ham-*
 " *mond's* Comment: On which I beg leave
 " to observe, that you cannot have a *better*
 " Authority, than *that* of *Abulvalid*, a
 " Grammarian, whose Opinion is always
 " decisive with *Dr. Pocock*. The proper
 " Notion of the *Arabic* Verb عَرَبَ is *absuit*,
 " *longe distitit*; from whence the Noun عَرَبٌ,
 " *prominentior pars cujusque rei*, *Vertex*."
 We do not want therefore a *Variation* in the
 present *Hebrew* Text; to justify our Tran-
 slators for giving *this* Sense to the *Hebrew*
 Word.

Lastly,

Lastly, *Psal. cxli. 6. Let not their precious Balms break my Head.* Here are two Difficulties to be sol'd: The First relating to שֶׁן שֶׁן, rendered *precious Balms*; and the other to יִי, translated *break*. Now, tho' our Translators have missed of the Psalmist's Meaning in both Cases; yet, perhaps, we shall find no Cause to part with the present Reading in either. The Hebrew Words שֶׁן שֶׁן are translated by St. Hieron, *Oleum Amari- tudinis, the Oil of Bitterness*; an Express- ion, which seems to be opposed to what we meet with, *Psal. xlv. 8. שֶׁן שֶׁן, the Oil of Gladness*. Again, שֶׁן שֶׁן, *Waters of Bitter- ness, or bitter Waters*, is a symbolical Form of Speech, which often occurs, for a *severe and rigorous Treatment*. As *Jer. viii. 14. ix. 15. &c.* The Oil of Bitterness will then denote a *Severity and Rigour*, exerted under the spe- cious Appearance of *Love and Friendship*; or the too *harsh and unkind REBUKES* of a *false Friend*: In which Sense the latter Clause will be a beautiful Antithesis to the former. *Let the Righteous rather smite me friendly, and reprove me; but let not the Oil of Bitter-*

Bochart, also translates the Hebrew Words, *Oleum praestantissimum*. But, I humbly conceive, that had this been the Psalmist's Meaning, he had written שֶׁן שֶׁן, *caput Olei*, not שֶׁן שֶׁן, *Oleum Capitis*. For so the Word שֶׁן is placed in all the other Instances alledged by this most learned Person, as שֶׁן שֶׁן *Ex. xxx. 23. שֶׁן שֶׁן Ezek. xxvii. 29. And שֶׁן שֶׁן Songs of Solomon iv. 14. Canaan L. i. c. 9.*

58
nely anoints my Head. But after all, if the
Seventy's *ἐλάττω*, the wicked, shall be
thought to maintain the Antithesis better to
the Word *righteous* in the former Clause, we
must be contented to admit a various Read-
ing, and to replace *ver* in the Room of
un.

Secondly, The Hebrew *יָבֵן* will be found to
have a very good Title to its Place, and to be
a proper Word as the Psalmist could have
used. This St. Hieron knew, who has very
rightly (as we shall presently see) translated
it by *impinguet*, let it fatten or anoint.
The Verb *יָבֵן*, or, which is the very same
Thing, *יָבַן*, in the Arabic Language, sig-
nifies *pinguem esse*, and is now found con-
strued with the Word *יָבֵן*. *Adeps, Oleum,*
&c. from whence the Arabs, at this Time,
say of a Camel *יָבֵן מְרִיחִין pinguescit*
(or, as *Gellius* renders it, *obruit*) eum *Pingue-*
scitudo. The Versions are now reconciled to the
present Hebrew Text; and the Arabic
Language has recovered a genuine Signifi-
cation of the Hebrew Verb *יָבֵן*, which was
entirely lost.

The foregoing Remarks, from the Eastern
Languages, were communicated by a learned
and ingenious Friend; who hath hereby
given us an ample Specimen of the great
Service, which may be done by their Help,
in explaining Scripture, and in reconciling
the Hebrew Text to the antient Versions.

And

And I heartily join with you in wishing, that Dr. *Hunt* may be soon induced to publish the *valuable* Dissertations of *this kind*, which he hath prepared; and may be soon placed in a Situation, that will afford him Leisure to digest his Papers; and he be no longer obliged to spend his Time, in teaching others the *first* Rudiments of a Language, over which he is so well qualified to *pre-*
sides.

OBJECTION. IV.

" You sometimes recommend an *Alteration*
" in the *Hebrew* Text; when the Context
" supports the present Reading."

I Shall begin with that Observation, which I have before hinted at on *Psal. vii. 11.* *God is a righteous Judge, strong and patient; and God [N] is provoked every Day.* You here Note, " that the former of these two
" Versicles is by ALL Interpreters, that I
" know of, rendered not as in the new Ver-
" sion [*viz. God judgeth the Righteous*] but
" as it now is in the Margin of our Bibles,
" *God is a righteous Judge.* For the Words
" *strong and patient* have nothing to answer
" them in the *Hebrew.*" The *Alexandrian*
Edition of the Seventy, published by Dr. *Grabe*, adds to the present *Hebrew* *καὶ ἰσχυρὸς*
καὶ μακροθυμὸς, *strong and patient*; and I cannot tell, why the Doctor suffered them to
I 2 continue

continue there, unless it be, that he found they had some good Title * to their Place. He hath indeed marked the last Word *μηνροθυμὸς* with an Obelus, to guard his Reader against admitting it too hastily; and I am inclined to think it is a *Scholion*, added by some later Hand, to explain the preceding Word *ἰαχὺς*, *strong*. But more of this presently.

The latter Clause you render thus, “ *And is not very angry every Day,*” on the Authority of the Versions which translate the Hebrew “*לֹא* by the Particle *Not*.” But, I think, the following Verse will not allow us to admit your Translation. Let us read it with the Context, *Ec. God is a righteous Judge, and he is not very angry every Day; if a Man will not turn, he will whet his Sword; he hath bent his Bow, and made it ready.* Now, this Translation represents the Deity with his Bow *bent*, and ready to take Vengeance on the Wicked, *tho’* he be not very angry. It is hard to reconcile this Sense to the *divine* Goodness and Compassion. If on the other Hand we read, *God is a righteous Judge and every Day provoked;* and, by Reason of these repeated Provocations, the *Psalmist* afterwards describes him, *armed with the Instruments of his Wrath, and ready to execute Vengeance;* the Sense is then

* They are extant in St. Hieron’s Copy of the Seventy.

strong and clear, and carries with it an interesting Motive to Obedience.

The Truth is, you have *here* another Specimen, like that which I have already given, of the *Obscurity and Confusion*, introduced into the *Seventy's Version*, by the *Hebrew Word* לח . The $\kappa \mu\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{o}\beta\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ is a *Scholion* added to the *Greek Text*; the preceding Words $\kappa \iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is *one Translation* of לח , added injudiciously to the *former Clause*; and $\mu\eta$ in the second is *another Translation* of the same Word. For the *Seventy* often render לח by $\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, as in *Isa. ix. 6.* and many other Places. We have *here* then three different Translations of the *Hebrew* לח , viz. $\kappa \iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, and *strong*, $\kappa \mu\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{o}\beta\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$, and *patient* added, as an *Explanation* of the former Word, $\kappa \mu\eta$, and *not*. And let it be observed, that the old *English Translators*, by subjoining to their Version the Words *strong* and *patient* to the *former Clause*, shew, that they did not always follow the *Chaldee*; and, if they had *not* followed the *Seventy* in this Place, their Translation had been more *just*.

2. But I must go back, and animadvert on the Alteration you propose at the fourth Verse of this *Psalms*; which, by the Authority of the Versions, you thus render, *If I have repaid Evil to him, that did me Evil; Or, if I have oppressed them, who without Cause are mine Enemies.* The Words of the first Clause, thus translated, “ carry, you say, a nobler
“ Sense

“ Sense, and more like the *Christian Doctrine* ;” and the Words of the latter, thus rendered, “ seem to you more *adapted* to “ this Place.” But let us examine what you assert. Now, the whole Substance of the two Members of the Verse, according to your Translation, amount to this *only*, that *David* neither *revenged* himself on his Enemies, nor *oppressed* them. The common *English Translation* is this ; *If I have rewarded Evil unto him that dealt friendly with me ; yea I have delivered him, that without any Cause is my Enemy* : And the Substance of the two Clauses, thus translated, is this ; “ if I have *basely injured* my *Benefactor* ; or if I have not *delivered*, or done a good Office to him, “ who without any Cause is become my *Enemy* ; then, &c.” This implies the Duty of *doing Good* to an Enemy ; your Translation intimates only the negative Duty of not *doing Harm*. The old Translation therefore carries the *nobler* Sense, and more like the *Christian Doctrine*. And if it could be proved, that *David* composed this *Psal*m, after he had *prevented Abishai* from killing *Saul* in the Cave ; you will then bear witness to him, that his *Behaviour* to *Saul*, considered in *both* Lights, as his *Friend* and *Enemy*, was *just* as he *here* describes it to have been.

3. *Psal*. xvi. 2. *My goods are nothing unto*

unto thee^a. Having recounted the several Senses, which the Versions give this Text, you conclude, That, "the Antients being so divided among themselves, we will leave the Choice to the judicious Reader, not being assured of any Thing, but that the Text is at present *corrupted*." Here I again differ from you, being of Opinion, that our *English* Translation, as here cited, conveys an excellent *Meaning*, and *suit*ed to the Context. Imagine *David*, now seated on the *Throne* of *Judah*, and surveying the *Affluence*, with which God had blessed him; and at the same Time casting his Eyes back on the *Sheepfold* he had formerly attended. His Heart over-flowing with the most *grateful* Sense of God's Goodness to him, in advancing him from so *low* and *mean* a Situation, to such a *Fulness* of Prosperity; he declares himself ready to *part* with any Portion of the good Things he enjoyed, in *return* of the Favours he had received: But, knowing that *these* were *insufficient* to add to the Happiness of the *Almighty*, he determines, that all his Delight should be placed on *relieving* the Saints, that *are on the Earth*, and *such as excel in Virtue*. *The Lot is fallen un-*

^a St. *Hierom* translates the present *Hebrew* Reading, *Bonum mihi non est sine te*, i. e. *I have no good without thee*; which, you say, is the Sense the *Chaldee* gives. This Sense therefore may be had, without supposing any *Corruption* of the *Hebrew* Text.

to me in a fair Ground; yea, I have a goodly Heritage; but my Goods are nothing unto thee; my Delight therefore shall be to the Saints, &c.

4. *Psal. xlix. 11.* Yet they think, that their Houses shall continue for ever, &c. Here you note that קרנם their middle or inward Thought, as we have since translated it, is no better "than an old Blunder of the Copiers" (as old, it may be, as the Time of *Chrysostom**) by transposing of two Letters, and "ר, instead of קרנם their Sepulchres; a Mistake avoided by all the old Translators—even the *Chaldee*, the Word being never "used in the Sense here put upon it." Hence you render the Words, "Their Sepulchres are" "their Mansions for ever; and their Dwelling Places for all Generations." It is easy to believe, that a Mistake may arise between two Words, so very like to one another, as קרנ and קרנ, by a Transposition of the Letters; and it will not be thought improbable, that

* It is a little older: For *St. Hieron*, so read in his Copy, q. v. But, on this Supposition, you must allow, that the *Chaldee* Paraphrast, who read otherwise, is older than *St. Chrysostom*. This Father flourished A. C. 398. Consequently, the *Chaldee* Paraphrase was made before the Hungarians existed; if it be true, that they were so called from the *Hunni*, who invaded that Country in the Reign of *Valentinian*, A. C. 452. And the putting Hungarians instead of Hagarenes, at *Psal. lxxxiii. 6.* is a Blunder of the Scribe or Printer, not of the Paraphrast.

the

the *Greek* Interpreters, (and *other* Interpreters after them, who followed the *Seventy's Division* of the Text) joining the *first* Clause of this Verse to the *last*, (as in *St. Hieron's* Copy of the *Seventy* it *now* is) might prefer the *faulty* Reading of a *Hebrew* Copy, which would suit the Words it was joined to, to the *true* Reading of other Copies, which would not. My Meaning is this; the *Clause*, joined to the *former* Verse, runs thus; *They leave their Riches for other; and their Sepulchres are their Houses for ever.* Here קבר, *Sepulchre*, agrees with the foregoing Words. But retain קרב, the *Thought*, and join the Clause as before, the Translation will be this; *They leave their Riches for other; and their Thought is their House for ever; Words, which have neither Connexion, nor Meaning.* This wrong *Division*^a of the *Hebrew* Text, I say, may account for the *Seventy's* Translation, and for those other also, which followed the *same* Division. But herein they preferred a *false* Reading to the *true*; and this will appear from the Words that follow, with which they can in no tolerable Sense be connected. Let us read them both together. *They leave their Riches for other. Their Sepulchres are their Houses for ever; and their Dwelling-Places for all Generations: They call their Lands after their own Names. Nevertheless, Man being in Honour hath no Understanding, but is compared to the Beasts that perish. This*
K
their

^a See more of this in the next Objection.

their Way is their Folly. Now, if any tolerable Sense may be made of these Words, (which it may not be an *easy* Matter to do) yet, to have observed, *That they leave their Riches for other, and that their Sepulchres are their Houses for ever; and then to add, they call their Lands after their own Names,* is so absurd an *Anticlimax*, that the Author of this *excellent* Ode will be thought *incapable* of committing it. Again, what Instance hath the *Psalmist* here given of their *Folly*? For thus he charges them, *This their Way is their Folly.* If it be answered, their not *understanding*. It is replied, their not understanding *what*? That their *Sepulchres* shall be their *Houses* for ever? But this he owns them to be sensible of, when they see that no Man can *deliver* his Brother from *Death*; and that *wise* Men die, as well as the *ignorant* and *foolish*. Or, that they *call* their Lands by their own Names, after they have *left* them to others? But I forbear from *pushing* this Point any further. Let us now examine the *Propriety* of the present Reading.

You say, "That the Hebrew קרב, is never used in the Sense here put upon it, the *inward Thought*." But surely you forget your self; since this Sense is applied to קרב in the Places cited below: And this Sense not only
corre-

* Thus קרב איש *Psal.* lxiv. 7. Is rendered in our new Version, the *inward Thought* of every one. Again, *Psal.*

corresponds with the Context, but also *illustrates* and *explains* it, as it may appear to do from this short Comment. “ The Rich and
 “ Mighty, being sensible as they must needs
 “ be, that they are liable to the same Inci-
 “ dents of *Mortality*, as other Men, and must
 “ leave their Riches for others; yet *think*,
 “ that their Houses shall be for ever, and their
 “ Dwelling-Places (descend) from one Gene-
 “ ration to another, and (therefore) call their
 “ Lands after their own Names; hoping to
 “ purchase to themselves an *imaginary Im-*
 “ mortality in the magnificent Houses, which
 “ they build; and in their Lands, which are
 “ called by their Names. But *Man being in*
 “ Honour abideth not” (for this I will ven-
 “ ture to call the true Reading) “ their Glory
 “ is as *short-liv’d* as *Themselves*; they shall
 “ carry *Nothing* away with them, y^e 16, 17.
 “ and shall fall like the Beast, which is forgot-
 “ ten, as soon as it perishes. This their
 “ Way, this Anxiety and Care for *perpetuating*
 “ their Memories, is their Folly; yet their Po-
 “ sterity praise and imitate their saying.” The
 wise and pertinent *Reflexions*, conveyed by
 this Sense given to the *Psalmist’s* Words, are
 so well grounded on the ordinary Usage and

Psal. lxii. 4. they give good Words with their Mouth, but
curse, בִּקְרָב, with their Heart, must mean, in their
inward Thoughts: And so must קִרְבִּי all that is within me,
Psal. ciii. 1.

Practice

Practice of Mankind, that should thirty Versions, instead of three, recommend the former Reading, they would not be, on your own Principles, a sufficient Warrant to alter the present Reading of the Hebrew Text.

5. I shall offer only one Instance more of the Objection now before us; which I take from *Psal. lxxv. 6. For Promotion cometh neither from the East; nor from the West; nor yet from the South.* Here you observe, " All the Antients, without Exception, take " (the Word *הרים*) in its most common Signification of *Mountains*; but then it must " be acknowledged, that the Sense is *imperfect*, and makes no entire Proposition, *quia* " *nec ab Oriente, nec ab Occidente, nec a desertis Montibus*; unless the Reading of the " Syriac be allowed, who instead of *הרים* " from the *Exit* (of the Sun) has *יציאת* *Exit* " or *Escaping* only (without the Particle " *from*) and so gives us this Meaning, *For* " *there is no Escaping from the West, nor* " *from the Desert of the Mountains, intimating* " *perhaps by the West, the Philistines; by the Desert of the Mountains;* " *Arabia Petraea.*" The Context is this; *I said unto the Fools, Deal not so madly, and to the Ungodly, Set not up your Horn. Set not up your Horn on high, and speak not with a stiff Neck. " For (according to your Translation) there is no escaping from the West,* " i. e.

“ i. e. the *Philistines*, nor from the Desert of
 “ the Mountains, i. e. *Arabia Petræa*. For
 “ God is the Judge, he putteth down one, and
 “ setteth up another.” I need only place your
 Translation and the Context together, to dis-
 cover how ill they agree. For how *absurdly*
 doth the *Psalmist* reason, if we make him
 talk in this Manner? “ Do not behave your-
 “ selves, O ye ungodly, with Arrogance.”
 Why? because there is no *escaping* from the
Philistines and *Arabians*. But, if God be the
 Judge, and pulls down and sets up, accord-
 ing to his own Will, as it follows, what need
 the *Psalmist* urge the other Reason, because
 there is no *escaping* from the *Philistines*, &c.
 In short, no *Explanation* of the Word **הָרִים**
 can better suit the Context, than what our
English Translators have made Choice of,
Promotion. Set not up your Horn on high, and
 speak not with a stiff Neck. “ For Promotion
 “ cometh neither from the East, &c.” It is
 wholly in the Hand of God, who pulleth
 down and setteth up.

“ **הָרִים** eo Loco (viz. *Psal.* lxxv. 6.) *Montes* notare non
 puto. Voces **הָרִים** commate 5, & 6. **הָרִים** commate 8.
 plane me ad notionem *exaltandi* ducunt: ne jam de *Scope*
Psalmi ipsius dicam, & *Consensu* aliorum Interpretum,
Adri. Relandi Palæstina, &c. p. 375.

OBJECTION

OBJECTION V.

“ Some of your Notes *explain the Hebrew*
 “ Text, in a Sense, *inconsistent with other*
 “ Places of *Scripture.*

1. **T**HE Masoretical Text of 1 Sam. ii.
 31. means just as our Translators
 have rendered it, *Behold the Days come, that*
I will cut off thine Arm, and the Arm of
thy Father's House : And your Remark on
 this Text is this : “ The *natural* Sense of the
 “ Context recommends the *present* Reading
 “ of the *Hebrew* (i. e. *without the Pointings*)
 “ זרע, thy *Seed* ; and that too is confirmed
 “ by the *Septuagint* and the *Chaldee* ; who
 “ both teach us to translate, *Behold the Days*
 “ *come, that I will cut off thy Seed, and the*
 “ *Seed of thy Father's House.*” Now, tho’
 it doth not appear to me, that, because this
 be the *Seventy's Translation*, therefore they
 read זרע thy *Seed* ; (since the Word זרע an
Arm, being a *symbolical Term*, may be sup-
 posed capable of the *same Signification*.) tho’
 I say the *Hebrew* זרע an *Arm*, may in a
figurative Sense signify *Seed* ; and have been
 so rendered in this Place by the *Seventy* ; yet,
 to pass by this, the Context, in the *first* Place,
 requires us to read, as the *Masorets* have
 pointed, and to translate the Text by the
 Word *Arm*, denoting *Dignity* and *Authority*.
 God

God had indeed foretold the *Death* of *Hophni* and *Phinehas*; but their Death was intended to be to *Eli* a *Sign* only of the *other* Calamity; which, as the Context informs us, was to happen also at a more *distant* Period of Time. *Behold the Days come, that I will cut off thine Arm, and the Arm of thy Father's House; and thou shalt see an Enemy in my Habitation,* (or, as it is in the Margin, *the Affliction of the Tabernacle, i. e. the Taking of the Ark*) *and there shall not be an old Man in thine House for ever. And the Man of thine, whom I shall not cut off from mine Altar, shall be to consume thine Eyes, and to grieve thy Heart: And all the Encrease of thine House shall die in the Flower of their Age. And this, that shall come upon thy two Sons Hophni and Phinehas, shall be a Sign unto thee, they shall both die in one Day.* It seems plain, that the Calamity denounced, *Ÿ 31.* by the cutting off the *Arm* of *Eli's* House, was the cutting it off from the *Altar* of God, as it is expressly said in *Ÿ 33.* and more fully explained in *Ÿ 36.* where it is foretold, that *Eli's* Seed should hereafter *come and crouch to the High Priest for a Piece of Silver, and for a Morsel of Bread, saying, Put me into one of the Priest's Office, that I may eat a Piece of Bread.* And of this sore Calamity was the Death of *Hophni* and *Phinehas* intended to be the *Sign*.

Secondly,

Secondly, Scripture, in another Place, *constrains* us to give the Words *this* Interpretation. *Eli's* Descendants continued in the *High Priesthood* till the Beginning of *Solomon's* Reign; and in the Person of *Abiathur* was this Prophecy fulfilled. But how was it fulfilled? Not in the cutting off of *Abiathur's* Seed; but in the Removal of him from his Office of High Priest; and so, in lessening the *Dignity* of his House. And in this Sense hath Scripture explained the *Meaning* of this Prediction. So *Solomon* thrust out *Abiathur* from being High Priest unto the Lord; that he might fulfil the Word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the House of *Eli* in *Shiloh*. 1 Kings ii. 27.

2. I now come to consider your Remark on *Psal. cx. 3.* which I place under *this* Head of my *Objections*; because your *Explanation* of the Text is utterly *inconsistent* with that which is given to it by the *Author* of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*; and if your Interpretation be true, the *Argument*, which the Apostle grounds on *his* Interpretation, is entirely *overthrown*. It is therefore the most *important* Remark of any I have hitherto considered; and so deserves to be *thoroughly* examined; which I shall attempt to do, by following you Step by Step; that I may leave *nothing* unanswered. And I cannot but premise, that few of your Observations are so slenderly supported, as are your *Objections* to the *Seventy's* Version in this Place.

"Thou art a Priest forever, *after the Or-*
der of Melchisedeck." "ALL the *antient* In-
 terpreters, you say, translate the latter Part
 of the Verse to this Sense—except the CHAL-
 DEE alone, who for, *after the Order of*
Melchisedeck, says, *because thou art a just*
Prince." I own, I am greatly surprized,
 that here you should take Notice of what the
Chaldee says, which Paraphrase you take so
 much Labour, almost in every Page, to pre-
 possess your Reader against; and on all Occa-
 sions blame our *English* Translators for copying
 after: Nor could I have believed, that you
 would urge it's Authority, at any Time, in Op-
 position to the unanimous Consent of all the other
antient Interpreters. But you go on: "Who
 (I suppose all the *antient* Interpreters)
 may perhaps be followed by *Aben Ezra*,
Kimchi, and some more of the *Jewish*
Rabbis, but by no other of the *Moderns*
 whatsoever." Now let me ask, Whether
 you can desire more Evidence for a just Tran-
 slation of a *Hebrew* Word, than the unani-
 mous Consent of all the *antient* Interpreters,
 and the most learned of the *Jewish* *Rabbis*?
 Or shall the Authority of the *Moderns* (who,
 as you sometimes complain, are now *incapa-*
ble of forming a Judgment of the Force of
Hebrew Words, because the *Remains*, that are
 left us of that Tongue, are so *slender*) Shall
 the Authority of the *Moderns*, I say, deter-
 mine us in any Point, against the whole Stream

How

L

of

of Antiquity, who were most capable of judging of this Matter ? But, *who* are these Moderns ? You cite none but *Buxtorf*, *Amama* and *Noldius*. What then do these Moderns say ? Why, “ they acknowledge, that על דבר or על דברת is a Phrase most commonly used before a Noun, to signify *for*, or *because of*.” Most commonly used : I believe so. But this implies, that these Moderns do not assert it is never used for something else. Nay, you misrepresent *Buxtorf*, if you do not allow, that he also acknowledges, that על דברת also sometimes signifies, *pro ratione*, after the manner ; and cites two Texts, where it is so used, (one of which we shall produce hereafter,) besides the Text now before us. But let me ask, What have these Moderns acknowledged, that makes at all for your Purpose ? “ They say, this Phrase before a Noun signifies *for*, or *because of* ; or, as you afterwards add, with אשר, *because that*.” What then ? Why, for that Reason, you will venture to translate the Phrase simply, *because*, which they don’t say it ever signifies alone. So that by translating the Moderns *Præposition* into a *Conjunction*, and rendering the Phrase, *because*, instead of, *because of*, you undesignedly have proved, not only, that your Translation is *ungrammatical* ; but also, that these Moderns, under whose Authority you would be thought to secure and fortify yourself, are against you, as well

well as the *Antients*. “ Nor is there one
 “ Passage in the *Old Testament*, in which this
 “ Phrase is by the *Septuagint* translated *κατὰ*
 “ *τάξιν*, or, by us, according to the Order,
 “ excepting this one Verse.” Allowing this
 to be *literally* true ; yet the *Want* of other
 Examples ought not to *supersede* the Autho-
 rity of the *Seventy* ; who were the *best* Judges,
 whether the *Hebrew* Phrase will admit the
 Rendition here given to it. And it should be
 remembered, that *some Hebrew Words* and
 Phrases occur only *once*, and are therefore
 called the *τὰ ἀπαξ λεγόμενα*. But more of
 this presently. Let us proceed : “ There-
 “ fore *Kimchi* concludes with his Version in
 “ this Form, *because thou art a King of*
 “ *Righteousness*.” But allowing this Version
 to be *Kimchi's*, as you assert it is (tho', I am
 well informed it “ is *not* his, but *some other*
 “ mentioned by *Aben Ezra* ;” yet) you just
 before observed, that *Kimchi* followed also
 the *Version* of the *antient Interpreters* : He
 has then given us a *twofold* Translation
 of this Verse ; and is as much on *one Side*,
 as on the *other* : So that *strictly* speaking, he
 is *no* Authority at all in the present Case. And,
 if he had expressed himself fully on one Side,
 and asserted that, *because thou art a King of*
Righteousness, was the *only* Sense the Words
 would bear ; I should be cautious, how I
 admitted *his* Testimony ; since it hath been

recorded of him, " That in his Exposition
 " of the *Psalms*, tho' otherwise a moderate
 " Inveigher against the *Christians*, he hath
 " let drop from his Pen some severe Reflexi-
 " ons against the *Christian Religion*.* But
 the Words will not admit this Version of
Kimchi; for, not to repeat that the Hebrew
 Phrase על דברתי will not grammatically sig-
 nify, *because*; " the Words מלכי צדק also will
 " not stand for, *thou art a righteous King*,
 " without the Addition of אתה, *thou*."

But this Translation of the Hebrew Text,
 " *Thou art a Priest for ever, because thou art*
 " *a righteous King*," is not only ungramma-
 tical, but also untheological. For it is not
 true, that *Christ* is a *Priest* for ever, *because*
 he is a just *King*; but on the contrary, he
 is a *King*, *because* he is a *Priest*. His *Exal-*
tation was the Consequence and Reward of
 his *Sufferings*. This is fully declared in the
 very last Verse of this *Psalms*, " *He shall*
 " *drink of the Brook in the Way, therefore*
 " *shall he lift up his Head*:" Because, as
Priest, he offered on the Cross his own Obla-
 tion of himself, as a Sacrifice for Sin; or,
 as *St. Paul* says, *because* " *he humbled himself*
 " *unto Death, even the Death of the Cross*,

* In *Christianos* parcus infectator, quamvis aliquando,
 & præsertim in *Expositione* nonnullorum *Psalmoreum*, con-
 tra Religionis nostræ Sacra calamum constringat acerbis-
 simam.—Claruit A. D. 1190, vel 1192. J. Bartolocius in
Analect. Rabbin. Hadr. Relandi.

“ therefore *bath* God given him a Name,
 “ *which* is above every Name, &c. Your
 Translation then of the Text is repugnant to
other express *Declarations* of Scripture, as
 well as of the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews*.

Upon the whole, Sir, you have not *one*
 Authority on your Side, for the *Amendment*
 you propose; no, not so much as a *modern*
 Authority: And the Version you recommend
 is *ungrammatical*, and *untheological*. Having
 therefore considered the *Force* of what you
 advance in Defence of the *new* Translation,
 you have offered; I shall now examine more
nicely the *Objections* you make to the *old*
 Version.

Before I begin, I must premise, that you
 give up the Jod in דברתי as *paralogical*, or
redundant; so Buxtorf and Aben Ezra judge
 it to be. It remains then to consider, what is
 the *Import* of the Phrase, על דברה, and whe-
 ther it will *signify*, what the Seventy *tran-*
slate it. This, I think, may be best *known*
 by recounting the several *Significations* of the
Radix, or Verb דבר.

1. The *Hebrew* Radix דבר in *Hipbil* sig-
 nifies *duxit*, he *led*, or *guided*. This Sense
 of the Word I gather from two Nouns, it's
Derivatives, which draw their respective
 Meanings from the single Notion of *Guid-*
ance and *Direction*; דבר, signifying a *Sheep-*
fold, because thither the Shepherd *leads* his
 Flock;

Flock; and דברות signifying *Ships*, because they are *guided*, or *steered*. Hence the *Dialects* almost unanimously agree in *confirming* this Sense of the *Hebrew Radix*. " In *Chaldee* " the Verb דבר is, *duxit, ductu certo rexit,* " *direxit, gubernavit*. In *Syriac* it is, *actus,* " *ductus, directus, gubernatus fuit* : From " whence the Noun דוברא, *ductus, regimen,* " *gubernatio, institutio*. In *Arabic* it has " the same Signification, *rexit, &c.*"

2. The *Hebrew Verb* is sometimes used in the *Old Testament* for *posuit, ordinavit, he placed, or ordered*. Thus *Psal. xviii. 48. And subdueth the People unto me*, וידבר עמים תחת, according to the *Seventy*, Καὶ ὑποτάξας λαὸς ὑπ' ἐμέ. And again the like Expression occurs in *Psal. xlvii. 3. He shall subdue the People under us*, and is translated again by the *Seventy* by the same Word. In both Places it is plain, that the Translation, which the *Seventy* give to the *Hebrew* וידבר, is τὰτω, for the *Præposition* ὑπὸ is prefixed on Account of the *Hebrew Præposition* תחת *under*, that follows. Hence also it seems, that the Verb " in *Arabic* has the same Signification, *viz.* " *disposuit, instituit*.

Now it will not be disputed, I believe, that the Nouns דברה and דבר will bear the Sense, which the *Radix*, from whence they are derived, is allowed to have. Take then your *Choice* of either of these *two* Significations; and each of them will be found to correspond with

with the Seventy's *τάξις*. For whether we translate the *Hebrew Word* in its *first Sense*, *Ductus, Regimen, Gubernatio, Rule, Government*, the *Greek τάξις* will be a proper and just Translation, as it signifies an *Office of Power and Authority*, either in sacred or civil Matters. Or, if we render the *Hebrew Word*, *Order, or Course*, according to its *second Signification*, *disposuit, instituit, he disposed, &c.* *τάξις* will suit to this Meaning also, as we find in *St. Luke*, c. i. 8. ἐν τῇ τάξει τῆς ἐφημερίας, αὐτοῦ, in the *Order of his Course*.

But "the Seventy," you say, "have in no other Passage of the *Old Testament* translated the *Hebrew Phrase* על דבר, טַּאֲשִׁיטַּי." But we must not wonder at this, if, what learned Men have remarked, be true, viz. That "the same *Hebrew Words and Phrases* are in this *Version* translated *different Ways* in different Places." Besides, we have seen, that the Seventy have *twice* translated the *Verb* elsewhere by *τάττω*, to *order*; why may they not then be allowed to render the *Noun* by *τάξις*, the *Order*? They have, on other Occasions, explained the *Hebrew דבר* by the *Greek Words* πρόσωπον, νόμος, τρόπος, all which have a Signification, much the same as that

So *Τάξις Ἀαζων*, *Heb. vii. 11.* Ordo Aaroniticus, the Office of *H. Priest*.

So in *H. Stephens*, *Τάξις ἐν τῇ πόλει*, Locus Reipublice gerendæ.

Prideaux, Conn. Part II. B. i. p. 46.

of *τάξις* in this Place: And if they have given the Phrase the same *Meaning* in other Places, how *unreasonable* is it to object, that they have not rendered it in the very same *Words*?

Lastly, you say "the *Hebrew* Phrase is no where translated by us (*i. e.* the *English* Translators) according to the Order." This may be literally true; and, I own, that in the narrow Enquiry I have been able to make, I do not find, that the *English* Translators have ever interpreted the *Hebrew* Phrase, precisely, according to the Order. But I observe, that they render it once, concerning the *Estate*, or *Condition*, as *Eccles. iii. 18.* and this Translation is not very different from the *first* Sense, in which the Word may be expounded in this Place. Again, I find they render כִּדְבָר *Isai. v. 17.* after their *Manner*^a; which will suit well enough with the *second* Sense, before laid down; and agree with the Explication, which the *Author* of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* gives of the *Seventy's* κατὰ τὴν τάξιν, after the Order, when he changes the Phrase into κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελλοειδίου, after the Likeness of *Melchisedeck. Heb. vii. 15.*

^a "One of the *Rabbis* there explains כִּדְבָר by כַּמְנַהגָם, secundum Morem aut Consuetudinem eorum, according to their *Manner* or *Custom*:" Which is the very same Explanation, as that, which *Aben Ezra* gives of עַל דְּבָרָתִי, in *Psal. cx. 9.* So לְכָל דְּבָרִי, *Numb. xviii. 7.* is translated by the *Seventy* κατὰ νόμον ΤΡΟΠΟΝ.

I do

I do not know what can be further *offered*, or *expected* to be offered, in *Defence* of the *Seventy's Version*. We see, that the *Sense*, in which they have explained the *Hebrew Phrase* now before us, is *confirmed* by the *Use* of it's *Radix*, and masculine *Noun* in the same *Sense*, in *other Places*; and *supported* by the joint *Consent* of the *Dialects*: That the Verb דבר is *translated* by the *Seventy*, by the *Greek* τάσσω, to *range*, or *place*; and the *Noun* דבר by τρόπος, *Manner*; which hath the same *Meaning*, as τάξις, *Order*: That the most *antient* *Interpreters*, and most *learned* *Rabbis* *expound* the *Hebrew Words* in the *same Sense*: And that the *Author* of the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews* has *espoused* the *Seventy's Version*. But *Dr. Mills*, it seems, hath said, " That " the *Author* of this *Epistle* was so *attached* to " the *Septuagint*, that he makes no *Reference*, " but to the *Greek Version*." The *Writers* of the *New Testament*, for the most *Part*, cite the *Texts* of the *Old Testament* in the *Seventy's Version*; and, considering they wrote in the *Greek Language*, it is *reasonable* to suppose, they would use the *Greek Version* on such *Occasions*, which at that *Time* was held in the greatest *Repute*. But the *Author* * of this *Epistle*

* *St. Paul* is now generally supposed to be the *Author* of this *Epistle*; and he is said to have used the *Hebrew*, as well as the *Greek Copy*. " *S. Barnabas*, opinor, ut & " *S. Paulus*, & *Hebræo* & *Græco codice utebatur.*" *Prol. ad Hist. Libb. Editionis Alex. Cod. c. 1. § 19.* And in his *Quotations* from *Psal. lxxviii. 18.* He re-

Epistle hath shewn no *particular* Attachment to this *Version*: And the Liberty he hath taken of *changing* the Seventy's Word *Τάξις*, *Order*, into *Ὀμοιότης*, *Likeness*, is a Proof, that he thought himself no ways concerned *always* to abide by the Seventy's Translation. And, I apprehend, that this *Alteration* proves also, he sometimes did *refer* to the *Hebrew* Text. For how can we otherwise account for his *changing* the Seventy's *Τάξις*, *Order*, into *Ὀμοιότης*, *Likeness*? The Greek Word *Τάξις* doth not signify *Likeness*, I presume; but the *Hebrew* דָּבָר doth, as we have seen; in making this Alteration, therefore, he certainly *refers* to the *Hebrew* Word, not to the *Greek* Translation. But to proceed: Dr. *Mills* also, it seems, asserts, "That if this Author's *Citations* in *Greek* " were to be *examined* and *compared* with " the original *Hebrew*, all his *Arguments*, " on those Points, would be discovered to " have no *Foundation* at all"—and you add, " no Doubt but *Kimchi*," (here you again *mistake* the Rabbi's Name; who was not *Kimchi*, but some other) " would have *received Gifts for Men*; which in *Eph.* iv. 8. he renders, *He gave Gifts unto Men*; he follows not the *Seventy's*, but (as some think, tho' without Cause,) the *Syriac* Version. Again, in his Citation from *Hosea* ii. 23. instead of, *I will have Mercy on her, on whom I had not Mercy*, which is the present Reading of the *Alex. Greek* Version, and the Reading which *St. Peter*, 1 *Ep.* c. ii. 10. follows; *St. Paul* renders the Words, *I will call her beloved, who was not beloved.* *Rom.* ix. 25,

" reckoned

“reckoned *this* Text (*viz.* *Psal.* *cx.* *9.*) for
 “one of them.” The Doctor’s Criticism is
 grounded on the Supposition, that the Author
 of this Epistle *found*s all his Arguments on the
Authority of the Seventy’s Version ; and on
 that *alone*. But, I humbly apprehend, this
 is a gross *Mistake* : Since, I presume, it will
 evidently appear to any one, who reads this
 Epistle with *Attention*, that the Author of it
argues throughout, with the *Jews*, on their
own Tenets and *Principles*. The Arguments
 he uses, are not grounded on the *Seventy’s*
 Version, but *fetched* from the *Jewish* Schools
 and Synagogues, and from the avowed Do-
 ctrines of the *Rabbis*. In particular, (for I
 shall confine myself to the Text, now un-
 der Consideration) the *Parallel*, which this
 Author draws, between the Character of the
Messias, and that of *Melchisedeck*, was not a
 Notion newly *formed* and *invented* by him, but
 an *antient* Doctrine of the *Scribes* and *Rab-
 bis*. For, two material *Circumstances* of this
 Parallel, as it is *explained* by this Author in
 his Epistle, had been appropriated to the
Person of the *Messias*, before our Saviour’s Ap-
 pearance. Bishop *Chandler* * informs us, it was
 a *received* Opinion among them, that the *Pa-
 rents* of the *Messias* would be *unknown* ; and
 to this Effect the *Jews* reason among them-
 selves concerning *Jesus* : *We know this Man*
whence he is : *But when Christ cometh*, no
 Man knoweth whence he is, *John* vii. 27.

* *Vindication of Scripture Prophecy*, Part i. p. 252, 253.

Again, *We have heard out of the Law*, (a general Term, under which is comprized all the *Old Testament*;) that *Christ abideth for ever*, *John xii. 34. i. e. a Priest for ever*; alluding, as I suppose, to the *Text* before us, *thou art a Priest for ever*. Now here are two Circumstances, viz. *An unknown Birth and Parentage*, and *a perpetual Priesthood*, appropriated by the *Jews* to the *Messias*, before our Saviour appeared: And these are the two most material Points, on which the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* grounds his Parallel between the *Messias* and *Melchisedeck*: *Melchisedeck*,—without Father, without Mother, without Descent, having neither Beginning of Days nor End of Life, being made like unto the Son of God, abideth a Priest continually, *Heb. vii. 3*. I conclude then, that the *Jews* did believe *Melchisedeck* to be a Type of *Christ*, before our Saviour appeared; and that the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* did not draw his Comparison between *Christ* and *Melchisedeck* from the Translation of the Seventy, but from that antient Opinion. But whence had the antient *Jews* this Opinion, that *Melchisedeck* was a Type of the *Messias*? I answer, from this Text of Scripture, which we are now considering. For, if this Notion had been taken from any other, the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* had not fail'd to quote it; as he hath this Text, at least five Times. And then it follows,

follows, that, if the *antient Jews* ventured to form a Parallel between the *Messias* and *Melchisedeck* on these Words of the *Psalmist*, they were very well assured the *Hebrew Phrase* *וְיִשְׁמַח* did properly signify, after the Order, or Likeness of *Melchisedeck*.

OBJECTION VI.

Other Exceptions there are to some of your *Critical Notes*; which, being not reducible to one Head, are here thrown together.

1. *PSAL. ii. 11.* “*Rejoice unto him with Reverence.*” Here it seems, that none of the *Versions* render the *Hebrew Words* in a Sense, that altogether pleases you, except the *Chaldee*. But as this is really no Objection to the present Reading of the *Hebrew Copy*, which will admit the Translation given to it in the old *English Version*, *Rejoice with Reverence*, I think there is no Need of a Change. If the Pronoun *וְ*, unto him, will make the Sense more intelligible; it may be supposed to have lost it's Place in the Text, on Account of the preceding Word *וְיִשְׁמַח*, rejoice, whose last Syllable is composed of the same Letters.

2. You observe, that *Psal. xxv.* “being an *Alphabetical Psalm*, i. e. wherein all the Verses, or so many Sets of Verses (or Members of Verses) “are to begin with the several

“ several *Letters* of the *Hebrew Alphabet* in
 “ their Order,” is particularly deficient in
 this Point; “ that if the Letter *Bet* may be
 “ found, yet *Vau* and *Coph*, at the Beginning
 “ of their several Verses, and Parts of some
 “ others are wanting.” And you make the
 like Observation on *Psal. xxxiv.* which, you say,
 “ wants two Members of Verses after the 5th
 “ Verse” (i. e. *one* Verse, which should begin
 with the Letter *Vau*;) “ and that the *last* Verse
 “ in both these *Psalms* is *supernumerary*,
 “ and out of Rule.” But it should be re-
 membered, That, since there is but *one* Word
 in the *Hebrew Language* beginning with the
 Letter *Vau*, (a Word *incapable* of being used
 on such an Occasion) it is not strange, this Let-
 ter should be sometimes omitted in the Al-
 phabetical *Psalms*; when the Conjunction *and*,
 could not be easily introduced: That,
 tho’ the Verse, which should begin with
Koph, be omitted in *Psal. xxv.* yet there are
 two Verses, beginning with the Letter *Resch*:
 That the *Psalmist* may from hence be sup-
 posed, to have forgotten himself at the first;
 and to be willing afterwards to supply the De-
 ficiency of *Koph* with a double *Resch*: That
 both these *Psalms* end with a Verse, to fill
 up the Omission of the Letter *Vau*: That this

• *Uncus*, a Hook. But the Omission of any Letter,
 in its Order, is no Proof, that the *Hebrew Copy* is im-
 perfect; when we have the full Complement of twenty
 two Verses, as we have in these *Psalms*.

supple-

supplemental Verse begins in each with the Letter *Pe*; to denote, perhaps, that it was designed to be supplemental; and to apprise the Reader, that the *Psalms* was מִדָּם *mutilus*, *claudus*, lame and imperfect, and defective of one Letter of the *Alphabet*.

It seems probable, indeed, that the Verse, which should begin with the Letter *Nun* in *Psal.* cxlv. hath dropt out of the *Hebrew* Text: Since the *Seventy's* and *Syriac* Versions agree in giving us a Reading, that will suit the *Place*, and the *Context*: viz. *The Lord is faithful in his Sayings; and holy in all his Works*; tho' you may observe, that the Words of the last Clause are exactly the same, as those we have again at *Y* 17. And had our old Translators inserted these Words into their *Version*, (as they have often done in the like Cases; as the Words *unto him* at *Psal.* ii. 11. and, *he spake the Word, and they were made*, at *Psal.* cxlviii. 5.) no reasonable Person, I presume, would have blamed the Liberty they had taken.

You justly observe, that the *initial* Letters of each Verse in these *Alphabetical Psalms*, "might have served for a *Guide* to the Hands of the old *Jewish Copiers*;" and I add, so they might also to the *antient Interpreters*. Yet as the *former* neglected this plain Rule; so did the *latter* also; and we cannot but be surprized at the unaccountable *Supineness* of the

Seventy.

Seventy, which Dr. *Grabe* ^a hath censured, (if the Reading now extant in the *Alexandrian* Copy be the *genuine* Translation of the *Seventy*;) who, at *Prov.* xxxi. 22. which is also, at the Conclusion, *alphabetical*, added to this Verse the last Word of the former; and so *destroyed* the *Alphabetical Order* of the Chapter. The *Seventy* have *divided* the *Hebrew Text*, of the *Psalms* ^b especially, sometimes in so *injudicious* a Manner, that great *Obscurity* is, by this *Inaccuracy*, thrown upon their *Version*. And it may be supposed that this *irregular* Division of the *Hebrew Text* hath sometimes induced them, to *vary* from the Reading of their own *Hebrew* Copies, and to adopt a *false* Reading. It will be expedient therefore, to pay *some* Regard to the *Possibility* there is, that *this* may be sometimes true; before we venture to *alter* the present Reading of the *Hebrew Text*, on *their* Authority. This *Precaution* may be added to those, already laid down in

^a *Prior Stichus* in MS. *Alex.* ita se habet: Δισσὰς Χλαινὰς ἐπὶ οἴκῳ τῷ Ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς. at nos δισσὰς in δισσὰ mutantes, hanc vocem cum *precedenti* sticho v. 21. ac verbo ἐπὶ οἴκῳ τῷ Ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς junximus, *autoritate* *Hebræi Textus*; in quo viginti duo postremini Versus Proverbiorum a totidem *Alphabeti Hebraici Elementis* incipiunt; adeoque □'נשׁ, ratione Ordinis, Versum non *inchoare*, sed *claudere* debet. Prol. ad *Psal.* c. 2. §. 10.

^b Vide Cl. *Grabii* Prol. c. 1. §. 2. Rursus, c. 2. §. 10.

“ *Omnia* autem, & singula Loca, in quibus *Stichos* *Alex.*

“ Codicis *mutavi*, recensere, ac *Rationes Facti* exponere,

“ *nimis tædiosum*, nec operæ pretium foret.”

the *Introduction*: And I will now subjoin an Instance or two of, what I now lay to the *Charge* of the *Greek Interpreters*, from your *Notes*.

3. The first Instance is taken from *Psal.* xc. 11. *But who regardeth the Power of thy Wrath? for even thereafter as a Man feareth, so is thy Displeasure.* To the latter Clause of this Verse the *Seventy*, and, from them I suppose, *Apollinarius*, join the first Word of the following Verse למנות, to number, or count. But, I apprehend, that the Verb ידע, he knoweth; and the Gerund למנות to number, cannot, by the *Rules of Grammar*, be connected with the *Conjunction* ו, and: That מנה to count or reckon, suits better with the Noun ימים Days, than with יראה Fear: That to count the Terror of God, is an Expression, not to be paralleled perhaps by any other Text of Scripture: That the following Verse, being deprived of the Gerund למנות to number, is rendered by the *Seventy* in such a Manner, that, I own, I do not understand their Meaning: And lastly, That the present Reading and Division of the *Hebrew Text* offers a Sense that is clear and intelligible; and which, according to *St. Hierom's Translation*, may be thus thrown into *English*, *Who knoweth the Power of thy Wrath; or thine Anger, according to the Terror of it?*

Here then, I say, the *Seventy* have injudiciously divided the *Hebrew Text*: And when

N

they

they had done so; how were they to *translate* the remaining Words of the first Clause of the next Verse, יָמֵינוּ כֵּן יִרְעַ, *So teach us our Days*. These Words, standing thus by themselves, they perceived were *unintelligible*; Yet some Translation was to be given. Therefore, whether they had a *faulty Copy*, which proposed the following *Variation*; or, whatever other Motive induced them to translate the *Hebrew* in the following Manner; certain it is, that the present Reading of the *Alexandrian Copy*, Τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ ἐκτενέμεν, *So make known thy Right Hand*, implies the following *Variation* from the present *Hebrew* Reading; viz. That the י of the Word יָמֵינוּ was *thrown out*, and the first Letter of the following Word, כֵּן, was *added* to it in it's Room; and the Word itself *changed* into יָמִין, *thy right Hand*. A *wrong Division* therefore of the *Hebrew* Text may sometimes have induced the *Seventy* to adopt a *faulty Reading*; and this proves the *Hazard* we run in attempting to *alter* the present Reading of the *Hebrew* Copy, on the *Authority* of the *Seventy's Version*.

4. The like *Obscurity* hath been introduced into this antient *Greek Version*, by the same Cause, as I apprehend, at the Ninth Verse of this *Psalms*. *When thou art angry all our Days are gone; we bring our Years to an End, as it were a Tale that is told*. The Sense of these Words is very plain and

and intelligible, and the Translation just; as I shall presently attempt to shew. I now observe, that of these *two* Clauses, the Seventy have made *three* distinct Sentences: And, whereas the *Hebrew* Text only furnished them with two *Verbs*, they were constrained to change the last *Noun* into a *Verb*, and to read *הָיוּ, ἐμελέτων, they meditated*, instead of *הָנָה, Meditation*. But when this was done, something still was wanted; the Sense of, *our Years they meditated*, would not pass; the Word *כְּמוֹ* remained to be translated; but this Word, signifying *as*, would not mend the Sense of the other; they therefore changed *כְּמוֹ* into *כְּמִוְ*, as a Spider, (*מ* and *ו* being similar Letters) and rendered the three last Words by, *Τὰ ἔτη ἡμῶν ὡσεὶ Ἀράχνη ἐμελέτων, our Years they meditated as a Spider*; making their former Nonsense still more absurd. Now this absurd Translation was occasioned by a wrong Division of the Words of this Verse: And this wrong Division was owing to the following Mistake: They had observed, at *ψ* 7. the Words *כָּלֵינוּ בְּאַפְךָ, we consume away in thy Displeasure*; and finding in this Verse the Word *בְּעִצְרוֹתְךָ, in thy Wrath* (which is the last Word in the first Clause) followed by *כָּלֵינוּ, we consume* (which

* This Account of the Seventy's Word *ἀράχνη* "Dr. Hammond long since gave (v. Not. in locum) from Schindler, the Noun *ו* being derived from the *Radix טוה, nevit, he spun.*"

is the *first* Word of the last Clause) they *parted* them both from their *own* Sentences, and with them made a new one, ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ σβίξεται, *we consume away in thy Anger*; thinking, that the *Psalmist* was here *repeating*, what he had *before* said, in *ψ* 7. But, if the Reader shall judge, that this Criticism is too bold an *Impeachment* of the *Seventy's Veracity*; I desire that, instead of the foregoing Words, *they were constrained* to alter הנה into הנו; and instead of, they changed כמ into כט, I may be allowed to say, *they found some FAULTY Copy, which had those VARIATIONS*. I at first suspected, that the *Greek Version* had been *corrupted* ^a in this Place; but finding the present Reading as old as *Clemens Alex.* ^b i. e. within an Hundred and ninety six Years after *Christ*, this induced me to conclude, that the present Reading was the *genuine* Translation of the *Seventy*; who herein have given us a *Proof*, that they were *liable* to the common *Frailty* and *Error* of Mankind; and were led into

^a The Conjecture was this; that the *Hebrew* כמ was originally כט, and the *Greek* ὅσα ἔτι ἄρα ἔσται, ὡς ἔτι ἄρα ἔσται, *Chaff*; by which Word the *Seventy* often render the *Hebrew* כט; and that הנה was at first written הנו, in *Pual*, *pelluntur*, as it elsewhere signifies, i. e. *our Years are driven away as the Chaff*. But the *Seventy's* ἐπιλείπειν opposes this Conjecture: And where the *Hebrew* Words may be explained in a Sense suitable to the Context, as in this Place, no Variation should be admitted.

^b Vide Opera, ex Edit. Cl. *Potteri*, p. 815.

this *Mistake* by a *wrong* Division of the Words of the *Hebrew* Text.

But you, Sir, have made some *Objections* to the common *Translation* of the Words before us, which must now be *answered*. *All our Days* are gone, פָּנוּ, which you tell us, " the *Seventy*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic* render by ἐξέλιπον, *have failed*, or are *spent* ;" and then you add, " but פָּנוּ never signified " *any such Thing*." Here you forget, that the *Lexicographers* interpret פָּנָה by *divertit*, *declinavit* ; and have overlook'd *Buxtorf*, who produces a *Proof* of this *Use* of the Word from *Jer. vi. 4.* פָּנָה הַיּוֹם, which he renders *Dies abit*, *declinat*, *the Day is going away*, and the *Seventy*, κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα, *the Day declines*, or *is wasted*. Again, you say all the *antient Interpreters* render the Word הִגָּה, a *Spider's Web* ; but I believe you are here *mistaken* again ; for, I suppose, they translate כְּמוֹ, by a *Spider*, or, a *Spider's Web*, and הִגָּה by, *they meditated*, as the *Seventy* evidently do^a. You add, " that הִגָּה never " signifies a *Tale*." But *St. Hierom* renders it *Sermonem loquens*, *one that telleth a Tale*, or *discourseth*. The *Hebrew* Word signifies the *Vapour of the Mouth* ; or, as it is translated, *Job xxxvii. 2.* *The Sound, that goeth out of his Mouth*. Hence it will also denote a *Discourse*, a *Tale*, a *Word*. And

^a Or ἀράχνη and ἰμαδίον may be a *double* Interpretation of the same Word, הִגָּה.

“ one of the *Jewish* Commentators, criticizing on the Word *הנה* in this Place, says, “ it signifies the *same* here, as it doth in the “ Text of *Job*, before cited, *i. e.* a *Word*, or “ *Thing* spoken.” The *Hebrew* Words therefore will admit of the Sense, fixed upon them in our *old* Version.

5. *Psal.* lxxxvi. 2. *Preserve thou my Soul, for I am holy.* On these Words you thus remark; “ *D. Kimchi* observes, that some “ wonder at this Saying, but with little Reason; and yet most of the Rabbis, sensible “ of the Offence, offer some *Excuse*, or *evasive* Explanation of the Expression, as *unfit* for *David*, or any Man; when in “ *God's* Sight no Man living shall be justified:” And then add, “ it is hardly to be “ doubted, but that the Reading of the *Syriac* “ and *Arabic* *הנה* thou, for *אני* I, should be “ preferred, and *רחם* rendered *gracious*, or “ *merciful*: *Preserve my Soul, for thou art “ gracious.*” *D. Kimchi* was in the Right, who said, that they, who wondered at this Saying, did so with little Reason: and the other Rabbis, if they had looked into the *Old Testament*, would not have been under the Necessity of offering a poor *Excuse*, or an *evasive* Explanation of this Expression. For the Appellation of *Holy*, is there attributed very often by *God* himself

to

• You shall be unto me—a *holy* Nation. *Ex.* xix. 6.
Ye shall be *holy*, for I am *holy.* *Lev.* xi. 44, and 45.

to his chosen People the *Jews*; and they were commanded to esteem themselves a *Holy* People, in Opposition to their idolatrous and impure Neighbours. *Absolute* or *inherent* Holiness cannot indeed be appropriated to sinful Man; and is the *incommunicable* Perfection of God. But there is besides a *relative*, or *derivative* Holiness; which is usually attributed not only to *Persons*, but also to *Things*, *Times*, and *Places*. With regard to *Persons*, this Holiness may be styled a *fæderal* Holiness; for it arises from the *reciprocal* Conditions of that *Covenant*, which is made between God and Man; and consequently is *twofold*, viz. a Holiness *communicated* to Man by God, thro' the Sanctification of his holy Spirit; and a Holiness, which Man obliges himself to *acquire* and *cultivate*. Hence every *Jew*, by the *Covenant* of *Circumcision*; and every *Christian* by that of *Baptism*, is made a *Holy* Person; having *engaged* himself, on his Part, to the Practice of Holiness; and being *sanctified*, on God's Part, with the Graces of his holy Spirit: And *Clemens Alex.* alluding^a to the *Gifts*, with which the *Jewish* Temple was *adorned*, styles *Christians*, Ἀγιασµένους τῷ Θεῷ, *Things consecrated to God*^b.

Ye shall be *holy*. c. xix. 2. and xx. 7. and 26. &c.

^a Ἀγιασµένους τῷ Θεῷ, the *Gifts* of the Temple. *Luc.* xxi. 5.

^b Cohort. ad *Gent.* p. 52.

The

The whole Purport therefore of *David's* Address amounts to no more than this: "Protect and bless me, O God; for *I* am of the Number of those *circumcised* Descendants of faithful *Abraham*, whom thou hast promised to protect and bless: *I* am of thy People, be thou my God.

6. *Psal.* cxxxix. 8. *If I go down into Hell, thou art there also.* Here you say, the Words *literally* signify, "*If I strow Hell*"; an Expression, in this Place at least, unknown to all the old Interpreters, (except the *Chaldee*;) for they phrase it, *if I descend into Hell*; and therefore probably used a Word not very different in it's Letters, *ואני ירה*, *if I reach quite to Hell.* To *strow Hell*, is a bold, poetical Expression, of the same Signification as that, which you recommend, *to reach*, quite, or even to Hell. The old Interpreters, perhaps, have not retained it in its full Force, in their Versions; but, translating it, *if I descend into Hell*, they have preserved it's Meaning. In the *Latin* Language *sternere Humum*, or, *Terram*, signifies to drop, or fall to the Ground; so in *Virgil*, *Æ.* viii. l. 719.

Ante Aras casi terram stravere Juvenci.

And the Authors of our old *English* Translation shew, that, in *their* Judgment, the present Reading of the *Hebrew* Text may be reconciled

reconciled to the antient Versions, who render the Hebrew Words, as these do, if I go down to Hell. Or, if we translate אציעה שואל, I make Hell my Bed, no one will dispute, I presume, that these Words do not convey as clear and strong a Meaning, as these, if I reach quite to Hell. In short, the Hebrew Verb ירד, taken in either of the foregoing Acceptations, very well suits with the Psalmist's Meaning; and " is supported by the similar " Arabic Verb يرد, which signifies dimittere, " humiliare, deprimere: And in the Text " before us, is really preferable to the Word, " which you would put into it's Room. For " ירד properly denotes a Motion downwards; " whereas ירד is of too general and lax a " Meaning; and signifies, as you shew from " 2 Chron. xxviii. 9. to reach up to Heaven; " as well as to reach down to Hell."

I have now followed you, Sir, through your *Critical Notes*, to the End of the Book of *Psalms*; and shall stop here giving you no further Trouble, at least, for the present. There are indeed some *obvious* Exceptions to your *remaining* Observations; especially to those, on the last Chapter of *St. John's Gospel*; which, from *Grotius*, you insinuate " is " not *St. John's*, but annexed to his Gospel " by the Church of *Ephesus*:" And in examining *these*, it might not be amiss to enquire also, what *just* Cause, *Dr. Mills* might

be thought to have, for passing his *Criticism* on the four or five *Citations*, made by the *Author* of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, " which " being examined with the original *Hebrew*, " all his Arguments on those Points would be " discovered," he says, " to have no *Foundation at all*": Especially, since you have given us cause to question the Justness of Dr. *Mills's* Criticism, in saying, at p. 97. that he is " much more famed for his *Diligence* than " for his *Judgment*." But my *present* Design is brought to a Conclusion ; which was to lay down some general *Precautions*, that seem necessary to be observed in comparing the *antient* and *authentic Versions* with the *Hebrew Text*; and to exemplify, from your *Notes*, what might serve to illustrate my *Meaning*. The Reader of your *Notes* may, perhaps, be induced to think, that some other of your *Criticisms*, omitted by me, may be comprised under some or other of the foregoing *Objections*.

An *Attempt* of this Sort, viz. To point out, what Use may be made of the *Versions*; and, under what *Restrictions* their *Authority* may be allowed, seemed likely to be serviceable, to younger Students more especially, in reading the *antient Interpreters* with the *Hebrew Original*. The Reader must determine, how much this Treatise may contribute

tribute to this Purpose ; to whose Judgment and Candour, the Rules and Precautions, herein laid down, are now referred by.

Sir,

Yours, &c.

A D D E N D A

- P. 13. l. ult. after the Seventy knew; add, who, as Mr. Fuller says, here render the Hebrew וְנָח according to the Sense it bears in the Syriac Language, "He overcame," l. i. c. 7.
- P. 52. l. 12. after the Gammas, add, Mr. Fuller hath also remarked, that the Seventy, and the Chaldee Paraphrast (who sometimes follows the Seventy's Version) interpret the Hebrew Words by the Syriac נָח or נָחַ, which signifies, duravit, perseveravit, l. v. c. 5.
- P. 92. l. 17. after is wasted, add, "Moreover, the Greek *καί* is justified by the constant use of the Verb נָח in the Arabic Language, which signifies "caducum esse, evanescere, perire; and is constantly put by the Mohammedan Writers to express this frail and transitory Life, in Opposition to the next, which they style אֶל-בָּקָא, permanent, or eternal."

CORRI-

[25]

BRITISH MUSEUM

CORRIGENDA.

- P. 18. l. 7. read תנצח
 — 21. l. 30. read נגביר
 — 31. l. ult. read l. i. c. 7. and add, see also l. iii. c. 20.
 — 38. l. 16. read (as well as *Aben Ezra* and *Kimchi*) in
 a Parenthesis.
 — l. 19. read מנני
 — 41. l. ult. for as read of
 — 42. l. 27. read חן
 — 56. l. 15. dele is
 — l. 19. read *Abuwalid*, and so l. 24.
 — 61. l. 7. read *manuscript*

Lately Publish'd, Price 1 s.

Sold by J. Fox in *Westminster-hall*, and
 H. CLEMENTS at *Oxford*;

THE Notes and Characters of the
 MAN OF SIN, laid down by the Apo-
 stle 2 *Thess.* ii. 4, &c. applied to the avowed
 Tenets and Practices of the Church of Rome.